Class 226.5 Q Book R41
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
PRESENTED BY

GLICK - RINDER 29 JAN '59

THE GOSPEL OF THE REJECTION

522-7-1

THE GOSPEL OF THE REJECTION

A STUDY IN THE RELATION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL TO THE THREE

BY WILFRID RICHMOND

CHAPLAIN OF LINCOLN'S INN

CBD THEOL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET
1906

46462

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PREFACE.

In considering the question as to the authorship and authority of the Fourth Gospel, the answer to a previous question is sometimes assumed. The previous question is this :—What is the relation to one another, *supposing* both to be equally authoritative, of the story told by the Fourth Gospel and the story told by the Three? Does the combination of St John's story with the story of the Three introduce difficulties, which are absent if the story of the Three is left to stand by itself? Does the treatment of the story of the Three as complete without the story of St John introduce difficulties,

which are absent if the story of the Three is combined with the story of St John? In reading Dr Drummond's "Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel" it struck the present writer that justice was not done to the contribution of the Fourth Gospel to the coherence and completeness of the story of the Ministry of our Lord. The following essay is an attempt to present the claim of the Gospel in this respect, and to give as simply as possible the answer to the question:—What does the Fourth Gospel do to make the story of the Ministry of Jesus Christ an intelligible whole?

The question is treated quite by itself. No attempt is made to indicate the bearing of the view suggested on questions of authenticity and authorship and authority. The only question considered is—What do we historically gain from the Gospel supposing its authorship and authority to remain

unshaken? The question whether we historically gain anything or not can only be tested by considering it on the hypothesis that the authorship and authority of the Gospel stand. When it has been considered, the result of the consideration will be one element in the case for or against the Johannine authorship and apostolic authority of the Gospel. *E.g.*, Dr Drummond's general conclusions would be modified if Chapter II. of Book I. in his work were to be re-written in the sense of this essay. How far or how it would be modified I do not attempt to discuss, though I am very sure that our debt to Dr Drummond would not be diminished.

The question with which I endeavour to deal is not merely a question of the external connection of the history of the Synoptists with the history of St John. It has to do not merely with the piecing together

of the references to time and place in the one narrative and the other. The relation of the two leads us on to questions as to the part which both narratives play in setting before us the purpose of Christ and its fulfilment, as that purpose and its fulfilment must be conceived in the light of the long history that had gone before, and in the light of the history that followed. It is a question not only of the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three, but of the view of the whole Gospel story in its context with the books of the Old Testament and of the New, with which the Gospels are bound up as parts of a literary and historical whole.

Apart from any value which this study of the Fourth Gospel may have as a contribution to the discussion of such questions as these, it is possible that it may have interest for those who read the books of the

Bible for their own understanding. If there is anything in it that is of value to any one it has come to the writer as the result of years of teaching, in which the Fourth Gospel has more and more commended itself as playing its part with the Three in bringing before the mind the vivid realities of the story of Him Who is our Life.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

THE THREE POINTS OF THE ARGUMENT.

PART I

CHAPTER I

JERUSALEM AND THE GOSPEL IN GALILEE

PAGE

1. The withdrawal into Galilee 4
2. The first note of opposition 5
3. Spiritual antagonism 9
4. The withdrawal from Galilee 12
5. The ministry of flight 15
6. The approach to Jerusalem 16
7. The Galilean story calls for a Jerusalem Ministry . 22
8. Intrinsic probability of a Jerusalem Ministry . . 26

PART II

CHAPTER I

THE GOSPEL OF THE REJECTION

1. What was the Gospel preached at Jerusalem . 28
2. St John's Gospel is a record of rejection . . 28

PAGE

§3. The rejection of the fulfilment of God's purpose by His own people at Jerusalem 32

§4. Hence a new society has to be formed in Galilee, whose formation is recorded by the Three . 33

§5. It is as the Gospel of Rejection that St John's Gospel is the Gospel of Manifestation . . 37

§6. But it is the rejection witnessed and recorded by one of the disciples of His Love . . . 42

§7. Embodying His own meditative memories of the Manifestation 43

§8. Seen in retrospect as the Gospel presents it . . 45

§9. The Gospel of the offer of (1) Life in (2) the Person of the Son of God 49

CHAPTER II

THE GOSPEL OF ETERNAL LIFE

Preparatory Stage: The Need of Life. (Chapters II., III., and IV.) 51

§1. *The Offer of Life: The Life that Heals.* (Chapter V.) 57

(My Father worketh hitherto and I work.)

§2. *The Bread of Life: The Water of Life: The Light of Life: The Conflict in Galilee* (Chapter VI.), *and in Jerusalem* (Chapters VII. and VIII.) 59

(Before Abraham was I Am.)

PAGE

§3. *The Life as the Divine Fellowship: The Separation* (Chapters IX. and X.) 65

(I and My Father are One.)

§4. *Conclusion: The Offer vindicated* (Chapter XI.), *and rejected* (Chapter XII.) 68

PART III

THE GOSPEL IN THE MINDS OF THE DISCIPLES

CHAPTER I

THE GROWTH OF APPREHENSION

§1. After the summary of the Rejection follows the final training of the apprehension of the disciples to witness its issue 71

2. The nature of their growth of apprehension illustrated by a comparison of St John's account of their mental attitude and that of the Three . 72

3. Apparent contrast between the two as to the acknowledgment of our Lord as Messiah . 74

4. Reasons why the acknowledgment should have been held in check in Galilee 74

PAGE

§5. The Galilean record shows a virtual recognition of Messianic authority from the first, but He was not the Messiah they expected . . . 77

§6. And it is at the climax of the trial of their faith in His Messiahship that the epoch-making confession is made 80

§7. The development, then, is in the deepening of their apprehension of the meaning of His Messiahship 81

CHAPTER II

THE LESSON OF THE INDWELLING LIFE

§1. The deepening of their apprehension still goes on: St John's Gospel itself is the climax, and the chapters before the Passion record one stage in the advance 83

§2. Three times the disciples come into St John's story: (1) before the contact with Judaism; (2) at the crisis of the struggle with Judaism in Galilee; and (3) now, as receiving the final interpretation of the offer of Life . . . 84

§3. It is the revelation to their love in the hour of parting, the promise of His Indwelling . . 86

§4. They have learnt (1) dependence on Him as (2) the Way and (3) the Truth 87

§5. He leads them on to the thought of Him as the

PAGE

Life—the identification with Himself through the Spirit 88

§6. The hour of parting enabled them to drink in the spirit of His teaching, and in that strength to go through the dark hour 92

CHAPTER III

THE ISSUE OF THE REJECTION

§1. The record of the Judgment and the Death is bare fact; the rest of the Gospel is the comment. From the first the Death was in view . 95

§2. As the Sacrifice 96

(*a*) Behold the Lamb of God.

(*b*) The Bread which I will give is My Flesh.

(*c*) Greater Love hath no man than this.

§3. As the "Lifting up" 99

Associated with the manifestation of the Father's Love and the attraction of the world.

(*a*) In the talk with Nicodemus.

(*b*) In the conflict at the Feast of Tabernacles.

(*c*) At the coming of Greeks.

§4. The kingdom which is rejected is the Kingdom of the Truth, the Truth of the manifested Love of God 102

§5. It is hard fact, as he, the disciple, then saw and felt the fact 104

CHAPTER IV

THE REVEALING FACT

PAGE

§1. "They knew not" till at the Sepulchre the disciple "saw and believed" 106

§2. He saw—the negative fact—not the return to life, the old life was over 107

§3. He saw—the linen clothes lying empty, revealing Life through Death 109

§4. The continuity is vital to the experience. Death was not an end but a beginning of the life that had risen from the grave-clothes . . . 110

§5. They sought no more the body of the dead. They waited for, and received the manifestation of the Living 111

§6. But it was from the negative fact that the disciple dated his conscious belief in the Gospel of Eternal Life 112

CONCLUSION

§1. St John's Gospel challenges interpretation as a Gospel of Jerusalem, such as the story of the Three and intrinsic probability alike demand . 113

§2. It is the Gospel of Eternal Life in the Son of God, the universal need of man, which the Jew had been Divinely prepared to receive . 115

§3. Rejected by the Jew, interpreted in its fulness to the disciple as the Gospel of the Indwelling Life 118

§4. Whose manifestation is the act of the Eternal Word by Whom all things were made . . 120

PART IV

PAGE

SUPPLEMENTARY ILLUSTRATIONS 122

CHAPTER I

INCIDENTS OMITTED AND INSERTED BY ST JOHN AND BY THE THREE

§1. The Biographical Fallacy 124

§2. The Virgin Birth 128

§3. The Ministry of St John the Baptist . . . 130

§4. The Temptation 134

§5. The Institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper 134

§6. The Agony 135

§7. The Incidents connected with the Crucifixion . 135

§8. The Doubt of St Thomas 136

§9. The Record of the Miracles 137

(*a*) Galilean miracles omitted by St John.

(*b*) Galilean miracles recorded by St John.

(*c*) Johannine miracles omitted by the Three.

(*d*) Necessary imperfection of explanations.

CHAPTER II

THE VIEW OF THE MIRACULOUS IN ST JOHN AND IN THE THREE

§1. The distinctive purpose of the Gospel the leading consideration 144

§2. Modern ideas of the miraculous must be eliminated 145

PAGE

§3. Words for "miracle" used by St John . . . 147

§4. Privacy and publicity of miracles 150

§5. Review of the miraculous in St John—the motive, the effect, and the view of the Evangelist . 152

(*a*) The turning of the water into wine.

(*b*) The signs at Jerusalem.

(*c*) Nicodemus and the signs.

(*d*) The nobleman's son.

(*e*) The impotent man at the pool.

(*f*) The feeding of the five thousand, and the walking on the sea.

(*g*) Christ's "brethren" and His "works."

(*h*) Words used at the Feast of Tabernacles.

(*i*) The man born blind.

(*j*) Words used at the Feast of Dedication.

(*k*) The raising of Lazarus.

(*l*) Words in the summary of the Rejection.

(*m*) Our Lord's knowledge of men miraculous as the knowledge of perfect Humanity.

CHAPTER III

THE PICTURE OF OUR LORD IN ST JOHN AND IN THE THREE

§1. Do the two pictures harmonise? 171

§2. First cause of the difference in St John's picture —his own personality 173

PAGE

§3. Second cause—his purpose to picture the Rejection of the Son of God 175

§4. The Galilean picture gives (1) the first appeal of Christ to man in the world 177

§5. (2) The Human Perfection of Christ . . . 179

§6. But the Galilean Gospels show the hidden glory . 180

§7. And in St John we have not lost the Christ of Galilee 182

§8. He makes the Eternal Love a fact . . . 183

THE GOSPEL OF THE REJECTION

INTRODUCTION

THE THREE POINTS OF THE ARGUMENT

THERE are three obvious points of contrast between the Three first Gospels and the Fourth: the scene of the events, the substance of the teaching, and the apprehension by the disciples of the Master's claim. The contrast is apt to be presented in some such form as this. (1) There is a harmonious and complete story of a Galilean Ministry presented to us by the Three, into which the acceptance of St John's Gospel compels us to intrude an inconsistent story of a Ministry at Jerusalem. (2) In the Galilean story of the Three there is a gradual development of teaching

about our Lord's Person, of His own claim for Himself, while St John's story of the Jerusalem Ministry presents us with the fuller teaching from the first, antedates the claim, makes it more definite and more emphatic, and carries it to a point which in the other Gospels it can hardly be said to reach. (3) In the story of the Three there is a gradual development in the apprehension by the disciples of the Master's claim, while in St John's story from the very beginning they accept His claim to the full.

As against the view thus generally indicated, we shall maintain (1) that the story of the Three presupposes the facts which St John supplies, and is only explicable if Jerusalem had already developed an antagonism to Christ; (2) that this antagonism was provoked by the revelation of truth, which Jerusalem ought to have been ready to accept, though (3) the Galilean disciples needed to be prepared and led on to its apprehension.

The nature of the argument will not allow

these three points to be entirely separated from one another. But it will be convenient to treat the subject under three heads corresponding to these three points, viz:—

Part I. Jerusalem and the Gospel in Galilee.

Part II. The Gospel of the Rejection.

Part III. The Gospel in the Minds of the Disciples.

Some supplementary discussions in illustration of the main thesis will be added in Part IV.

PART I

CHAPTER I

JERUSALEM AND THE GOSPEL IN GALILEE

§1. *The Withdrawal into Galilee.*

THE record of the very beginning of the Galilean Ministry points back and points elsewhere. "When He heard that John was delivered up He *withdrew* (ἀνεχώρησεν) into Galilee."[1]

Where did He withdraw from and why? St John tells us. He withdrew from Judæa.

[1] St Matthew (iv. 12), gives us this note of withdrawal. St Mark (i. 14), has simply "After that John was delivered up Jesus came into Galilee." St Luke's words, "returned (ὑπέστρεψεν) in the power of the Spirit into Galilee," if they stood by themselves, would be most naturally taken in connection with the Baptism and Temptation, but they plainly admit of the meaning which the natural force of St Matthew's word would impose upon them.

He had not found Jerusalem ready to receive what He came to give. He withdrew at the time of St John the Baptist's imprisonment.[1] St John[2] gives us a reason for His withdrawal which exactly fits the note of time. It was because Jesus "knew how that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John." He was beginning to be regarded as a more dangerously successful teacher than John. He did not wish the antagonism to draw prematurely to a head which, as we shall see, He had already felt to be present in the atmosphere at Jerusalem.

§2. *The First Note of Opposition.*

In the course of the Galilean Ministry proper we may note three special occasions when Jerusalem comes into the story. (1) The Healing of the Paralytic; (2) The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost; (3) The Eating with Unwashen Hands.

(1) The story of the Healing of the

[1] St Matt. iv. 12; St Mark i. 14. [2] St John iv. 1.

Paralytic strikes the first note of opposition. The opposition is Pharisaic. And this first mention of Pharisaic opposition is associated with the mention of Jerusalem. The story is ushered in by St Luke[1] with the words: "There had sat themselves down [there] Pharisees and Doctors of the Law which had come out of every village of Galilee and Judæa and Jerusalem." The words suggest, though they do not necessarily imply, a deliberate gathering for a purpose. There is nothing to shew, though the language at least covers the possibility, that the purpose was to hear and to judge the new teacher. The opposition is not outspoken. It is discerned before it is expressed. They reasoned "in their hearts. Who is this that speaketh thus? He blasphemeth. Who can forgive sins but God alone?" And our Lord immediately knew in His Spirit that they thus reasoned.

There is nothing to suggest any previous conflict elsewhere. But the first manifestation of an instinctive opposition is in a

[1] St Luke v. 17.

gathering of Pharisees among whom are Pharisees from Jerusalem, and the presence of a spirit of opposition is recognised by our Lord.

The spiritual situation indicated is in harmony with that described in the second chapter of St John where, though many believed, Jesus did not commit Himself to them for He "knew what was in man"; *i.e.*, the opposition, which seems to come from Jerusalem, is at that stage at which it would naturally be after our Lord's first contact with Jerusalem.

After this first note of opposition has been struck the relation between our Lord and the Pharisees becomes more and more clearly defined. Before the healing of the paralytic we have already come upon our Lord's first healing on the Sabbath Day, the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum.[1] This had provoked no protest. After the healing of the paralytic, the plucking of the ears of corn on the Sabbath[2] does provoke protest. And at the healing of the man with

[1] St Mark i. 21 ; St Luke iv. 31. [2] St Mark ii. 23.

the withered hand,[1] they watch Him to see whether He will heal on the Sabbath Day that they may accuse Him, and Jesus looks round upon them with anger, grieved at the hardness of their hearts, "and the Pharisees went out and immediately held a council with the Herodians how they might destroy Him." In St Matthew's story[2] there follows a note of withdrawal. He withdrew from "thence" and "charged" them whom He healed "that they should not make Him known."

And there have been decisive signs that He for His part has deliberately chosen not to build on the established Jewish religion. When they murmur at His eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, He answers, "I am not come to call the righteous but sinners."[3] When they ask why His disciples do not fast like the disciples of John and of the Pharisees, He answers—and the fact that they did not do so is itself significant in the same sense—that no one sews new cloth on an old

[1] St Mark iii. 1. [2] St Matt. xii. 15. [3] St Mark ii. 17.

garment. Already He regards the official Pharisee religion as a worn-out garment which could only be cast aside.

§3. *Spiritual Antagonism.*

"The Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,"[1] the next notable mention of Jerusalem in connection with the opposition to our Lord's Ministry, takes us to a climax in the development of the spiritual antagonism.

The circumstances are as follows. Jerusalem has been mentioned in all three Evangelists as one of the places from which, after the choice of the Twelve, there was gathered the multitude which came to hear Him and to be healed of their diseases, and they that were troubled with unclean spirits were healed,[2]—the multitude whose presence inspired Him to deliver to His disciples the discourse which in St Matthew is

[1] St Mark iii. 22.

[2] St Luke vi. 17. Cp. St Mark iii. 8; St Matt. iv. 25.

represented by the Sermon on the Mount, in St Luke by the Sermon in the Plain.

It is after this that St Mark[1] records that "the scribes which came down from Jerusalem" said that He cast out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, and that He on His part said, that "all their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men —but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness." And he adds: "because they said, He hath an unclean spirit."

In St John, after the healing of the cripple on the Sabbath Day at the Unknown Feast He told "the Jews"[2] that His works bore witness of Him that the Father had sent Him, and that they had not His word abiding in them for whom He sent, Him they believed not. And we must interpret this in the sense of His own reference to it later on: "Are ye wroth with me because I made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath Day?"[3] The work of mercy should have appealed to them in itself as

[1] St Mark iii. 22. [2] St John v. 36. [3] St John vii. 23.

the work of God. That it did not do so was the sign of the fatal alienation of spirit. The spiritual situation is the same as when He is grieved with them because of the hardness of their hearts, or when He tells them that to ascribe His works of mercy to an evil spirit is blasphemy against the Spirit of God. Any attempt to relate the event in St John to the events in the other Three Gospels in any definite order of time, any attempt to indicate the point at which the visit to Jerusalem at the Unknown Feast is to be fitted in to the Galilean story would be out of place. But the fact stands that a decisive step in the growth of the antagonism to our Lord is referred in St Mark to "the scribes who came down from Jerusalem," and that the spiritual situation thus created is in harmony with the spiritual situation in that part of St John's Gospel in which we should look for the correspondence if it were Jerusalem that inspired the antagonism.

§4. *The Withdrawal from Galilee.*

The third notable mention of Jerusalem as the source of opposition is especially to be remarked because of the time when it occurred, and the events by which it is followed.

There is one point in St John's Gospel at which he diverges from his usual plan. Speaking generally it may be said that he records the story of a Ministry at Jerusalem, and does not record events recorded by the Three. In telling of the Feeding of the Five Thousand he touches the Galilean story, and he touches it at a point which is central and critical in all the Gospels. He, St John, tells the story obviously for the sake of the discourse on the Bread of Life which follows on, and is connected with, the miracle. And in the discussions in the Synagogue at Capernaum, which are embodied in the record, it is "*the Jews*"[1] who are said to murmur concerning Him because He said: "I am the Bread which came

[1] St John vi. 41.

down out of heaven;" it is "*the Jews*"[1] who strive with one another saying: "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" The term "the Jews" used in these two places, instead of the indefinite "they," stands often in St John for the representatives of the Jewish religion. And the suggestion of the story is that the scene of the conflict with the representatives of the official religion, which it is St John's purpose to describe, is at this point transferred from Jerusalem to Galilee.

It is at this time then that St Mark tells us[2] that "There gather themselves together unto Him the Pharisees and certain of the scribes which had come from Jerusalem" to find fault with His disciples for eating their bread with defiled, that is unwashen, hands.

The context in the story of the Three is as follows. The return of the Twelve from their Mission is associated in their story with the death of St John the Baptist, itself suggestive to our Lord of His own

[1] St John vi. 52. [2] St Mark vii. 1.

coming death, and with Herod's superstitious fear that Jesus was John risen from the dead. As it was St John's imprisonment which called attention to our Lord's dangerous popularity as a teacher, so St John's death is likely once more to bring Him into dangerous notice. The need of facing this situation seems to have been one of the motives which prompted His retirement into the desert. The multitude follow Him, and the Feeding of the Five Thousand raises His popularity to a point which intensifies the critical character of the situation. It is at this point that, according to St Mark, as according to St John, a mission from Jerusalem appears to confront Him in Galilee.

And this view of the situation of the moment is confirmed by what follows. "And Jesus went out thence, and withdrew into the parts of Tyre and Sidon"[1] It is as though they had now driven Him from Galilee.[2]

[1] St Matt. xv. 21.

[2] Cp. Note on St John vii. 1, Pt. II., ch. ii., p. 61.

§5. *The Ministry of Flight.*

When we take note of our Lord's movements there are always, apart from the obvious Evangelistic motive, three considerations to be remembered, (1) The growth of opposition: (2) The growth of superficial popularity, and (3) The growth of apprehension in the disciples. The retirement from what has been the main sphere of His work at this time was determined in part by all three. It is with reference to the first that the period may perhaps be called a Ministry of Flight, during which He is seeking out in the outlying borders "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," "out of all places whither they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day," first in the parts of Tyre and Sidon, then round through Decapolis to the Eastern side of the Lake of Galilee, then in the region of Cæsarea Philippi.

During this period there are warnings of His coming death, after St Peter's confession (where St Matthew says "that He

must go unto Jerusalem"), and again after the Transfiguration. When He comes to the west side of the lake[1] the Pharisees "come out," and begin to question with Him, and He immediately comes again to the other side. When He again "passed through Galilee[2] He would not that any man should know it," for again, "He taught His disciples and told them, the Son of Man is delivered into the hands of sinners, and they shall kill Him." With this passing visit to Galilee at the end of the Ministry of Flight closes the Ministry in Galilee itself, and with it the "withdrawal" of our Lord.

§6. *The Approach to Jerusalem.*

We now enter on a period when His face is turned *towards* Jerusalem.

St Mark's Gospel, which is primarily concerned with the Galilean Ministry, touches very lightly on this period. He introduces it[3] with the words: "And He arose from thence and cometh into the borders of Judæa

[1] St Mark viii. 10. [2] St Mark ix. 30. [3] St Mark x. 1.

and beyond Jordan." St John,[1] after the second of the two visits to Jerusalem which he records between the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Passion, indicates the same region as the place to which Jesus returned, "And He went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John was at the first baptizing, and there He abode." In x. 32 again St Mark indicates in a vivid phrase the prevailing tone of the period he is describing. "And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: and they were amazed; and they that followed were afraid." And it was then that "He took again the Twelve and began to tell them the things that were to happen to Him saying, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem."

The period which is thus briefly indicated by St Mark, St Luke dwells upon at length, crowding into it not only the incidents but the teaching which seemed to him to belong to the great approach to the Passion, humility, self-denial, the mercy and pity of love. He opens his account of it with words of deliberate

[1] St John x. 40.

solemnity.[1] "And it came to pass when the days were well nigh come that He should be received up, He stedfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem." Again later,[2] "And He went on His way through cities and villages, teaching and journeying on towards Jerusalem." And immediately afterwards,[3] "In that very hour there came certain Pharisees saying to Him, Get Thee out and go hence, for Herod would fain kill Thee. And He said unto them, Go and say to that fox, Behold I cast out devils and perform cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I am perfected. Howbeit I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow, and the day following, for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem." And on these words follows the great cry, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets and stoneth them that are sent unto her how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto

[1] St Luke ix. 51. [2] St Luke xiii. 22. [3] St Luke xiii. 31-33.

you desolate: and I say unto you, Ye shall not see Me until ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord." And still before these prophetic words are fulfilled, on what must have been the last actual approach, it was "as they were on the way to Jerusalem," when He was passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee, that He healed the lepers, and there were not found to return to give glory to God save the one stranger.[1] And further on,[2] "He took unto Him the Twelve, and said unto them, Behold we go up to Jerusalem." And again,[3] He added and spake the parable of the pounds, "because He was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear." And finally at the last stage of the approach,[4] "When He drew nigh, He saw the city and wept over it saying, If thou hadst known in this thy day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon

[1] St Luke xvii. 11.
[2] St Luke xviii. 31.
[3] St Luke xix. 11.
[4] St Luke xix. 41.

thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee, and compass thee round and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground and thy children within thee, and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."

The two evident features of this period, that the hostility of Jerusalem is assumed, and that our Lord is setting Himself to face it, reappear in St John's record of the two visits to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles and at the Feast of Dedication. St John[1] seems to indicate the Feast of Tabernacles as the end of the time when Jesus "was walking in Galilee" to avoid the hostility of the Jews.[2] He represents our Lord as going up secretly to the Feast, not publicly, because His hour was not yet come. The spiritual situation described is a confused conflict between ill-informed adherents and increasingly determined opponents. The attitude of His opponents is not yet fully recognised. The multitude

[1] St John vii. 1. [2] Cp. note p. 61.

say to Him:[1] "Who seeketh to kill Thee?" others say:[2] "Is not this He whom they seek to kill?" and no man dare speak openly of Him because of the Jews.[3] They seek to take Him, but no man laid hands on Him.[4] The officers who are sent after Him are mastered by the majesty or the charm of His words. Nicodemus[5] can still speak for Him among the rulers. As He speaks[6] "Many believe on Him," but as they are brought face to face with His claim they are repelled. And the story of conflict ends with their taking up stones to cast at Him.[7] At the Feast of Dedication[8] the Jews have agreed that if any man should confess Him to be the Christ he should be cast out of the synagogue. He for His part condemns them with a spiritual condemnation which is final and decisive.[9] "Ye believe not because ye are not of my sheep." Again[10] they took up stones to

[1] St John vii. 20.
[2] St John vii. 25.
[3] St John vii. 13.
[4] St John vii. 30.
[5] St John vii. 50.
[6] St John viii. 30.
[7] St John viii. 59.
[8] St John ix. 22.
[9] St John x. 26.
[10] St John x. 31.

cast at Him. Again[1] they sought to take Him, but He went forth out of their hand.

St John is describing the Jerusalem towards which St Luke pictures the gradual approach, the scene of the earlier stages of the conflict, which was proceeding towards its inevitable end.

§7. *The Galilean Story calls for a Jerusalem Ministry.*

In this review of the references to Jerusalem in the three Galilean Gospels, it seemed desirable to indicate at each stage the harmony between the spiritual situation pictured by the Three, and the spiritual situation pictured in what must be supposed to be the corresponding section in St John's Gospel. But the references to St John's Gospel have perhaps obscured the argument from the Galilean records alone. Eliminate then from our review every reference to St John. Imagine that we had only the Three. How would they leave us?

[1] St John x. 39.

The Galilean Ministry begins abruptly with the suggestion that it is a withdrawal from some other sphere.

Opposition to our Lord begins to be manifested early, but not from the first.

It begins at a point at which there is mention of Jerusalem.

After this, opposition is provoked by causes, which before this had not provoked opposition.

The opposition grows. In the course of its growth a marked stage in its growth is associated with a second mention of Jerusalem, and here the opponents are said to have come down from Jerusalem.

A third mention of Jerusalem is more definitely suggestive of a mission from Jerusalem for the purpose of opposition.

It is followed by a withdrawal into more distant parts of the country during which, while the manifestation to the immediate circle of the disciples continues, forecast of His death as the issue of the antagonism begins, and of the death at Jerusalem. The deliberately unobtrusive character of His

visits to Galilee during this period makes the withdrawal more emphatic.

So far it may be said that the opposition may have been provoked in Galilee itself, where the Pharisaic spirit and the Pharisaic body would naturally have its representatives, and the references to Jerusalem may merely imply some use of the means of communication which the Pharisee organisation may well have provided — either the Pharisees of Galilee referring to the Pharisees of Jerusalem, or the Pharisees of Jerusalem hearing of the danger and sending down to strengthen the hands of the Pharisees of Galilee. This account of the facts is possible, but (1) it does not account for the "withdrawal" at the beginning of the Galilean Ministry, and (2) it does not account for the events thus far in such a way as to make them form part of a continuous history with what follows. And the facts admit at least as readily of the interpretation that opposition had already in some way originated at Jerusalem, and that thence it travelled down to Galilee.

Next we come to a period when our Lord is half-way to Jerusalem. Here the narrative is pervaded by the tone of determined approach to a terrible and inevitable conflict. It is very difficult indeed to suppose that this conflict has become inevitable only in consequence of what has passed in Galilee. The lament over Jerusalem, even if it does not imply that attempts have actually been made to gather her children, does most certainly imply that the attempt is manifestly hopeless. How has it become so? Is it conceivable that it has become so without the effort being made? The parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, taken by the Pharisees as directed at them, implies the condemnation of the official representatives of the Jewish religion for rejecting an offer which, so far as the Three are concerned, has never been made. If we were left only with the materials for reconstructing the story which they provide should we not say: "Surely there is some great omission. There must have been a series of events of which we have not heard, a story of a

manifestation and a rejection at Jerusalem which has not come down to us?"

§8. *Intrinsic Probability of a Jerusalem Ministry.*

And this conclusion would be reinforced by considerations in themselves of overwhelming force. *Must* there not have been a Ministry at Jerusalem? Can the claimant of the title of the Son of David have failed to make His claim in the City of David? Can the successor of the Prophets have failed to bear His witness at the heart of the national life and the national religion? Can the successor of Jeremiah have failed to face the rulers of His people on their own ground? Can the successor of Ezekiel have done otherwise than speak God's words to them whether they would hear or whether they would forbear? If the task of calling Jerusalem to repentance was hopeless, do the analogies of prophetic history allow us to suppose that it was therefore unfulfilled? Nay, was there no aspect of the Truth

which could be presented at Jerusalem as it could be presented nowhere else? Was there no special and peculiar manifestation called forth by the place which God had chosen to set His name there? Do not the Three then cry aloud for a Gospel which should tell us some such story as is told us by the Fourth? And if these considerations lead us to put upon the data supplied by the Galilean story the interpretation that Jerusalem did inspire the opposition which we find manifested in Galilee, we may put this last question in a different form. What was the presentation of Himself by which our Lord had provoked at Jerusalem the antagonism which we find manifested in Galilee? The Galilean Gospels end with the story of the Crucifixion, but they cannot be said to explain the Crucifixion. What did provoke the Crucifixion? What was the history of the growth of that spirit of rejection of which the natural culmination is the Cross?

PART II

CHAPTER I

THE GOSPEL OF THE REJECTION

§1. *What was the Gospel preached at Jerusalem?*

THE question suggested by the consideration of the references to Jerusalem in the Three is not, when and how was the Gospel as we know it in Galilee preached also in Jerusalem, but rather, what was the Gospel preached at Jerusalem? This is the question to which St John's Gospel gives us the answer.

§2. *St John's Gospel is a Record of Rejection.*

The Gospel of Jerusalem, as it appears in St John, does not profess to be the same

as the Galilean Gospel. And St John's Gospel itself shows us the reasons for the difference between the two.

St John's Gospel is from the beginning a record of rejection. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not" is the summary of its subject. If we look at the situation described in the second and third chapters of the Gospel we see that this issue is marked out from the first.

He goes up to Jerusalem at the Feast of the Passover. He chases the traders and money-changers from the Temple Court. He claims that it is His Father's House. The fury of His zeal carries all before it. The act was one which to a discerning spiritual mind would justify itself. Here it struck no sympathetic chord. It is true that, whether because the rulers were momentarily paralysed by the vigour of His onslaught, or because they did not yet perceive the significance of the claim which it involved, it did not evoke any manifestation of deep spiritual antagonism. Their protest only took the form of a demand for

an external sign to authenticate an act which should have vindicated itself. But His answer in a parable, unmeaning to them, treats their protest as showing them to be beyond the reach of His appeal.

Again while He is in Jerusalem at the feast many believe on His Name, beholding His signs which He did. But He sees their belief to be worthless. And if we ask why their belief was worthless, we have the answer in the talk with Nicodemus. They are ready to believe in Him as a teacher. They do not realise the need of a new life, of a new spirit to be put within them. The teacher of Israel understood not these things. And so He withdraws first into the borders of Judæa and then into Galilee.

The first contrast then which is suggested between Jerusalem and Galilee arises from the fact that Jerusalem was instructed but not spiritually minded. There was an atmosphere of familiarity with religious ideas, but there was no sense of spiritual need. "Thou hast hid these things from the wise

and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." The withdrawal from Jerusalem to Galilee was an anticipation of the later withdrawal of St Paul from the Jews to the Gentiles. In the one case as in the other it was a very sorrowful withdrawal. As St Paul had great sorrow and unceasing pain in his heart for his brethren's sake, his kinsmen according to the flesh, who were Israelites, whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises, so our Lord cries out His lament over Jerusalem. And, even in the words just quoted, when He rejoiced in spirit because the Father had hid these things from the wise and prudent, and had revealed them unto babes, it was with the exaltation of soul which belongs to the sacrificial acceptance of spiritual pain. In the words, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight," there is not wanting a foretaste of "Father, not My will, but Thine, be done," the sadness whose shadow seemed always to rest upon His spirit.

§3. *The Rejection of the Fulfilment of God's Purpose by His own People at Jerusalem.*

And in the one case as in the other we cannot help wondering as to what might have been. If Jerusalem had known the day of her visitation, if the purpose of God had been fulfilled by man's response instead of being thwarted by man's refusal, how would the new Israel have been built up?

Nor can this be altogether a hypothetical question. Here Jerusalem was, to receive or to refuse the call. Her refusal of the call was to do for the world what her acceptance of it might have done. It was the thing that might have been which she refused. We are so familiar with the idea of our Lord having come to do the thing He did, to found a new spiritual kingdom, that we forget that what He really came to do was what He did not do, to transform the Israel that was into the Israel that was to be Here at Jerusalem the kingdom was

a fact. Here was the centre of the organised life of the nation, whose life, so far as it lived, was its religion. Here were the rulers of God's people, the scribes who sat in Moses' seat. Here there could have been no question of founding a new spiritual society, but of transforming a long since founded society. Here was the body into which the new spirit should have been breathed, if it had been ready to receive it. Built up by a long succession of spiritual experiences, the experiences which create those spiritual habits and spiritual instincts in which the character of a nation consists, here the nation stood, the kingdom wanting its king, the body wanting its spirit —wanting, but not willing to receive, either the king or the spirit which He came to bring.

§4. *Hence a New Society has to be formed in Galilee, whose Formation is recorded by the Three.*

Failing this acceptance, the new society, the kingdom, had to be created elsewhere,

and to build up this new society became accordingly the first object of our Lord's Ministry in Galilee. The materials were such few Israelites indeed as He could find among the lost sheep of the House of Israel, and mould into the new society of which He was Himself the Spirit and the Head.

Perhaps there is nothing so miraculous in the history of the Gospel as His success in this task. It is no small matter to make a nation, to call into being a common ἦθος, a body of common habits and common instincts, which shall issue hereafter in common institutions and common principles of life consciously professed and held. Centuries of history, we know, go to the creation of a nation, though we are apt to take for granted the result of the growth, the spontaneous appearance in a number of individuals of a common temper and a common mind, instinctive, undefined, but the dominant reality of the life of the individual members of the nation.

It is the history of the spiritual creation of such a social entity that we follow in

the Old Testament, a history so tragically careless of the generations as they pass, so intent on the few through whom the tradition is maintained and the type developed, the type which time after time rises again from the moral and spiritual wreck of the nation, rises to new heights in protest against the national degradation and decay.

This was the task which our Lord undertook, out of the remnants of the spiritual wreck of a nation to build up the beginnings of a new society; to embody in a living fellowship a new type of character, a character destined, as the Jewish character had been destined, to inspire all humanity, a fellowship which should aim at including all nations within its scope.

The task imposed upon Him limitations, reticence, restraint, lest a premature and superficial apprehension and acceptance of His claims should hinder the growth of character, the formation of habit and instinct deep within the soul, bred in the personal fellowship of His disciples with Himself. This was the task which He was

driven to attempt and to achieve by the failure of the Jewish nation, as represented, and truly represented, by their rulers at Jerusalem — their failure to rise to the national call for which the Providence of God had prepared them. It was His accomplishment of this task which was historically the source of the existence of the Christian Fellowship. It is the story of the foundation of this Fellowship which the Three Galilean Gospels record. They do not profess or attempt to give a complete account of His life. They record the impress of His character upon themselves as He launched Himself upon their world in Galilee. Their picture of Him is reflected in the history of their own souls. We are gazing into the mirror of their minds, we are seeing the deeds and hearing the words through which He drew them to Himself, by which He fashioned them from within. It is impossible to detach this aspect of the Galilean Gospels and to present it separately. It is interwoven with the whole fabric of the story that they are the witnesses to

the origin of the Christian Fellowship in the following of Christ. Jerusalem, which had rejected Him, they only mention when it obtrudes itself upon their story, as the source of opposition, as the scene of the condemnation and the crucifixion.

§5. *It is as the Gospel of Rejection that St John's Gospel is the Gospel of Manifestation.*

And yet here nevertheless at Jerusalem the offer must be made, made only to be rejected, that the offer and the rejection might stand on record. And St John tells us how the offer was made—the offer of the new life—and how it was rejected. The same spirit of negative and passive rejection, whose presence our Lord felt on His first public visit to Jerusalem, underlies and inspires the more positive antagonism of the succeeding scenes. He was offering new life to those who did not need it, to a religious society which had become identical with "the world," whose religion, that is,

was organised on the basis of self-sufficiency. He was offering healing and deliverance to those who knew no need of healing or deliverance, and to whom the work of mercy made no appeal. He was offering the Bread of God and the Water of Life to those who knew no hunger and thirst after righteousness, and the Light to those who were blind and in darkness, but who said "we see." They were aliens from the fellowship of the Divine Love, which was the Life He came to give. He did not come to them, as to the Galileans, offering to them as individual souls a spiritual society, into which they were to be received. He came to them as to a spiritual society, such as they should have been, offering to them the spirit, the new life, which they had been divinely prepared to long for and to receive. He came to them as to a kingdom waiting for its king, the king who was to vindicate his claim to rule over them by the manifestation of the Divine Love, and to exercise His rule through their welcome of the manifestation. If they had been of the

Truth they would have heard His voice. They sealed their rejection with the words which unconsciously expressed their repudiation of the Messianic promise, "We have no king but Cæsar."

The fact that it is thus the Gospel of the Rejection gives to St John's Gospel at first sight a strangely unpractical character. The manifestation of our Lord at Jerusalem leads to no result except rejection. At Jerusalem itself there is no recorded instance of immediate acceptance except the man born blind. Joseph of Arimathea appears late upon the scene as a secret disciple. Nicodemus seems to be gradually won. He did not trust Himself to those who "believed on His name" at the first Passover. Those who believed on Him when He spoke of His being lifted up are immediately afterwards repelled.[1] And a

[1] Dr Sanday has commented on the ambiguity of the one word which denotes all the different stages of belief. The context, both in chapter ii., where our Lord did not trust Himself to those who are said to have believed on His Name, and in chapter viii., where those who "believed on Him," or "believed Him," are driven away by the suggestion that they need the gift of freedom, is in each case decisive

Gospel which is not accepted is necessarily a Gospel obscured. The utterance is checked, it is not completed by the amplification which a sympathetic hearing calls forth. It is a Gospel in the air.

But this apparently unpractical character of the Gospel by no means belongs to its substance. Sheer moral fact is the core both of the Gospel and of its rejection. No simpler moral issues could be conceived than those which are presented by our Lord's acts. The making of the House of God a house of merchandise was just such an obvious iniquity as would have stirred the wrath of Amos or Jeremiah. It was sheer moral blindness which prevented them from welcoming the condemnation. The healing of the cripple at the pool on the Sabbath Day was a plain work of mercy. Of such a work He might well say,[1] "The very works that I do bear witness of Me, that the Father hath sent Me." It is to the

that phrases, in which we might naturally have read the deeper meaning, really bear the shallower significance of "believing."

[1] St John v. 36.

plain moral issue that He appeals when He says in reference to this work,[1] "Are ye wrath with Me because I made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath Day?" In the same sense we should take His words in chapter x., spoken probably in reference to the healing of the man born blind, whose blindness He refused to consider in any other light than as it called for healing. In the discourse of the Good Shepherd[2] He had said, "I know Mine own and Mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me and I know the Father, and I lay down My life for the sheep." And this thought governs what He now says in reference to His works:[3] "The works that I do in My Father's name, these bear witness of Me. But ye believe not because ye are not of My sheep. If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not, but if I do them, though ye believe not Me, believe the works, that ye may know and understand that the Father is in Me and I in the

[1] St John vii. 23. [2] St John x. 14-15.
[3] St John x. 25, 26, 37, 38.

Father." This is the Truth which they will not hear, this declaration of the Father's Love.

But because they will not hear, the Gospel remains throughout its story of rejection a Gospel of manifestation, the Gospel, as St John describes it in the Preface, of "the Word." It is the truth which will out. It is the truth which must manifest itself, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.

§6. *But it is the Rejection witnessed and recorded by one of the Disciples of His Love.*

But plainly this very drama of Rejection could not have been recorded if it had not been acted out in the presence of one of those who believed, and in whose belief the whole story is framed. It is a drama within a drama. We see the one drama as it was witnessed by a person in the other. The Revelation of Rejection is witnessed and recorded by one of those who had themselves received the Revelation of love. Before

the series of events begins which make up the story of the Rejection, we have a record of the initial acceptance of our Lord by His disciples. They had found the Messiah,[1] He had manifested forth His glory and His disciples had believed on Him.[2] We have only very scanty glimpses and indications of their presence as the story of the Rejection proceeds—three times only at Jerusalem itself before the Passion.[3] After the rejection is an accomplished fact,[4] and before it takes effect in the Crucifixion, we have the record[5] of the final Revelation of love in the light of which they witnessed the last issue of the Rejection, and saw and believed the victory into which it was transformed.

§7. *Embodying His own Meditative Memories of the Manifestation.*

It is the record then by a disciple of teaching not directly addressed to disciples, not directly adapted to the state of mind

[1] St John i. 41, 45, 49.
[2] St John ii. 11.
[3] St John ii. 22; ix. 2; xii. 21.
[4] St John xii. 36-50.
[5] St John xiii.-xvii.

in which they were then when this disciple heard and treasured what he heard. How much he heard himself and remembered, how much he derived from others—from Nicodemus, for instance, or the woman of Samaria, or the man that was born blind—we cannot attempt to say. How far his being known unto the High Priest may have given him access afterwards to sources of information from within the circle of those who took part in the conflict between the rulers and the new teacher, how far his contact with this region of life and opinion may have enabled him at the time to enter into the meaning of what he heard, it is perhaps impossible to attempt to judge. It seems to be evident that, in the Gospel as a whole, he is presenting us with the results of the growth of his own spiritual apprehension of utterances, whose significance he came gradually to realise and understand, utterances which must have been largely enigmatical to the disciples at the time, and which were understood only in retrospect, as the society which our Lord was

building up came to be conscious of its strength and being, and to need the record of the first steps in the conscious knowledge of the Spirit that was its Life. It is the record of a brooding meditative memory. Words of Christ come back to him, spoken in the heat of the great conflict, burnt into his heart, the heart of a passionately loyal partisan, as his soul thrilled with the sense of battle—these come back upon him, when time and years and all that had gone between had taught him their meaning, words spoken to others and handed on to him, treasured side by side with words which he had heard himself, treasured and thought over and ordered into the wondrous story, in which He shows us, as it was exposed in that spiritual Passion which went before what we call the Passion, the inner truth which was at the core of the Gospel of Life.

§8. *Seen in Retrospect as the Gospel presents it.*

That the substance and purport of this teaching became part and parcel of the

life of the Church is evident from a comparison of the working Gospel of the Church, as it is exhibited in the early Epistles of St Paul, with the Gospel of the Three.

The contrast between the two is striking in many ways. That a record, so uncoloured by a creed or by a reflective theory of the religion whose origin it pictures as the Gospel of the Three, should have lived on through the time when St Paul's early epistles were written, and when we see, not from what he maintains but from what he assumes, that a creed, a reflective theory of the Gospel, had become part of the daily life of the Church, is a wonder which is done away by no theory of the origin and credibility of the documents concerned. But what concerns us here is that the creed, the current creed of the Church of the early Epistles, is the creed of the Four Gospels, not the creed of the Three. To take the two most obvious instances, the Johannine doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the principle of life in the believer only appears in two passages

in the Three.[1] It appears five times in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, and is so much part and parcel of the whole conception of the Christian life implied in 1 Corinthians, that no enumeration of the passages in which there is explicit mention of the Holy Spirit in this relation would do justice to the facts. And the Johannine doctrine of the co-equal Godhead of the Father and the Son, which in the Galilean Gospel appears explicitly only in the baptismal formula,[2] and in St Matthew xi. 27, and St Luke x. 22, is again part and parcel of the working creed of 1 Corinthians.

But though the purport and effect of the Revelation to the disciples through the Ministry at Jerusalem thus plainly passed into the conscious soul of the Christian Society, we can well believe that it took all the years, which the longest span of human life could give to the disciple that witnessed of these things and wrote these things, to afford him the spiritual perspective

[1] (1) St Matt. x. 20; St Luke xii. 12; (2) St Luke xi. 13.
[2] St Matt. xxviii. 19.

in which he sees the story that he tells. The Gospel has been in this respect compared to the prophetical retrospects of the Old Testament. To accept the comparison as luminously suggestive is not necessarily to accept any view, with which the suggestion may be associated, as to the degree in which the record of sheer fact enters into the story. The value of the suggested comparison would not be diminished, if we believed St John's to be the most trustworthy historical guide of all the four Gospels. And as regards our present purpose of describing in outline the Gospel of Jerusalem, the Gospel of the Rejection, even if it must be largely a matter of individual judgment of what proportion of the discourses in St John we can say—These are the veritable words that fell from the lips of Christ—even if we were to accept the conclusion that the writer himself would hardly have been able to distinguish the original remembrance from the later interpretation which emerged in his mind, as reflection led him to the true understanding of its meaning—the fact that

these questions are left undiscussed and undecided is so far from incapacitating us from asking what are the main lines of the teaching of the Gospel of the Rejection at Jerusalem, that the answer to this latter question may well put us in a better position for giving to the former questions such answer as they may need to have or may be able to receive.

§9. *The Gospel of the Offer of Life in the Person of the Son of God.*

The Gospel of the Jerusalem Ministry then is the Gospel of the offer of (1) Life; (2) in the Person of the Son of God.

Since the offer of life is not accepted, our Lord is continually driven back, in self-defence, on the personal claim which was involved in the offer and justified it. Hence there is a triple development to be observed:

(1) The Development of the Offer of Life.
(2) The Development of the Rejection.
(3) The Development of the Personal Claim.

It is in meeting the rejection of the

offer that the offer and the claim become separated from one another, that the personal offer of Himself as the Life is converted into a personal claim to the possession of the authority and right to make the offer. The offer being rejected, the claim remains, and remains—not by His act but by theirs—isolated from the offer of which it was naturally a part. And the successive stages in the development of the Gospel of Life are accordingly marked by a series of great utterances in which the personal claim crystallises, and stands out as the ground of conflict. These successive stages in the development may be briefly indicated here.

CHAPTER II

THE GOSPEL OF ETERNAL LIFE

Preparatory Stage: The Need of Life (Chapters II., III., and IV.).

When our Lord purged the Temple at the Passover, His act was nothing less than a national call to repentance, an appeal to the need of moral regeneration. The scene presented by the Temple court was an outrage to Jehovah, the God of Righteousness. His act was a rebuke of sin, touching probably directly the interests of the rulers, the High Priestly caste, who would be the gainers by the traffic, but addressed to the conscience, not only of the rulers, but of the religious community at large. The moral appeal fell flat. There was no moral response. The traffic was probably not specially

popular, and this may have checked the expression of the resentment which the rulers would naturally feel; but in a spiritually inert religious society it may well have been regarded with the acquiescence of a merely passive dislike. At any rate, the only recorded response is a demand for an external sign to justify the act. The answer — as to the rebuilding of the Temple—to those to whom it was made merely enigmatical, and signifying on His part only His entire disregard of the temper that prompted the demand, in itself pointed on to a future manifestation of the power of renewal of religious life. It was understood by them literally of the fabric. It was meant by Him no doubt somewhat in the sense of "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." It was afterwards referred by the disciples to the Resurrection, as the supreme manifestation of the life-giving power. The act of rebuke did not bite home enough to provoke any notice of the claim involved in the words, "My

Father's House." The claim is here put forward merely in its natural association with the act. It is not aggressively put forward, and there is no controversy to draw it into separate prominence.

The offer therefore is—the call to repentance, the offer of moral regeneration. The rejection simply lies in the fact that the call to repentance is disregarded, that the need of life, the need of moral regeneration, is unfelt. And the claim is the claim of authority implied in the act, and expressed in the words, "My Father's House."

This passive rejection appears in another form as apparent "belief on His Name," belief which he rates at its true value and disregards. The significance of the fact that He disregards it can scarcely be exaggerated. Plainly it made a great impression on the disciple at the time that He should do the works which evoked belief, that the belief should be evoked, and that He should disregard it. It implied in our Lord a sense that virtue had not gone out of Him, that the Love had manifested itself,

and had met with no real response. The rejection on His part of the unreal response testifies to the strength of the expectation, to the spiritual force which He had put forth, to the significance of the appeal which He had made, and made in vain.

And the inner meaning of the whole story of the first offer to Jerusalem is given to us in the talk with Nicodemus. Nicodemus represents the highest point reached at Jerusalem in the apprehension of the offer of our Lord. And the highest point reached is the recognition of our Lord as a teacher come from God. Against this attitude of receptivity towards new teaching, our Lord sets the need of the new birth without which no man can enter into the Kingdom of God. "The teacher of Israel" failed of his vocation, who did not understand this need. This, the need in man of the new life from God, was the "earthly thing." To be ignorant or unconscious of this need of a new life was to be incapable of apprehending the "heavenly" thing, the offer of eternal life which the Love of God would give through

the lifting up of the Son of Man, as God had given life and deliverance of old when Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness. This was the nature of the rejection at its earliest stage—the unconsciousness of spiritual need, which rendered them incapable of hearing and believing the offer of spiritual life that was to be made. This was the root of that antagonism which grew into embittered enmity. Nothing is so provocative of apparently unreasoning hatred as the suggestion of a deep defect of which the subject is unconscious, the offer of a moral rehabilitation which he does not feel himself to need. It gives mortal offence to the deepest instinct of self-sufficiency. This is the rooted moral enmity with which at Jerusalem our Lord finds Himself face to face from the first.

Feeling Himself to be in an alien and unreceptive atmosphere, He leaves Jerusalem, at first for the borders of Judæa, and then, on the imprisonment of St John the Baptist, for Galilee.[1]

[1] Cp. Part I., §1., pp. 4, 5.

The journey through Samaria shows us what thoughts were uppermost in His mind as He turned His back upon Jerusalem: (1) The gift of the Spirit — "Thou wouldest have asked of Him and He would have given thee Living Water"; (2) The conviction of sin, which was the first step towards receiving the gift—"Come, see a man which told me all that ever I did"; (3) The spirituality of the worship or service of God which was the end to be attained—that which it was the privilege of the Jew to know — "We know what we worship," "They that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth," "The Father seeketh such to worship Him;" and underlying all these, though put forward only to confirm them — "We know that Messiah cometh," "I that speak unto thee am He."

The upshot of this visit to Jerusalem, preparatory to the offer of the new Life and the Rejection which was to follow, is that the rejection of the offer of the Divine Life by the Jewish religion as an organised whole is predetermined by their whole moral

attitude, by the absence of response to the moral appeal, by the absence of spiritual discernment of the meaning of His signs, by the absence of any sense of the need of renewal, of the need of a new Life.

Nevertheless the offer had to be made, and made to them, in order that through the witness of His own who believed, it might stand on record as the appeal of the Love of God to the sin of man through His people whom He had chosen.

§1. *The Offer of Life: The Life that Heals* (Chapter V.).

The Life is offered first as the Healing Life. This is the simplest, the most obvious, the most direct appeal that could be made. The healing of the impotent man at the Pool is the appeal of a work of mercy, done on the Sabbath Day as a challenge to the Rulers of the Jewish religion to welcome the work of mercy as God's work done on God's Day. The Sabbath is God's rest. The work of mercy is a part of that work

of Love which God worketh even until now in this present time which is the day of His Rest. The work should have spoken for itself, and shown that He who did it came from God. As it did not speak for itself to them, He is driven to justify it in words which embody His claim as the Son to interpret the Father's mind, and to do the Father's life-giving work. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." "As the Father raiseth the dead, and quickeneth them, so the Son also quickeneth whom He will."[1] He does nothing of Himself.[2] He does not bear witness of Himself. The works which the Father hath given Him to do, the very works He does, bear witness of Him that the Father hath sent Him.[3] They have not His word abiding in them.[4] They have not the Love of God in themselves.[5] And so the outcome of this manifestation of the Life as Healing Power is that "for this cause the Jews sought to

[1] St John v. 21.
[2] St John v. 19.
[3] St John v. 36.
[4] St John v. 38.
[5] St John. v. 42.

kill Him,"[1] because, not seeing the moral appeal of the work of mercy, and therefore resenting it as a breach of the Sabbath, they further resented the claim of "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," the claim to be verified only in the apprehension of the work of Love as Divine, the claim that He was one with the authority from which the religious institutions of Judaism derived.

The latent antagonism has now developed into a declared opposition with a definite issue, the claim of a Divine authority, but the manifestation proceeds upon its course.

§2. *The Bread of Life: The Water of Life: The Light of Life: The Conflict in Galilee* (Chapter VI.) *and in Jerusalem* (Chapter VII.).

At the next point at which St John takes up the story, the opposition thus provoked at Jerusalem has followed Him to Galilee, and the conflict there set up then surges back to Jerusalem. He now

[1] St John v. 18.

presents Himself not as the Healer, the Deliverer, but as the Satisfier of the constant needs of the soul. "I am the Bread of Life"—"If any man thirst let him come unto Me and drink,"—"I am the Light of the World," identifying Himself with the Father in the manifestations of His care for His people in the wilderness after the deliverance, the giving of the manna, of the water from the rock, of the light to guide them on their way.

It is on the occasion of the first great utterance, just at the time when our Lord's popularity in Galilee reaches a climax—"they were about to come and take Him by force to make Him king"—that the opposition of "the Jews" breaks in, not only to strengthen and consolidate the tendencies which in Galilee ran counter to this popularity, but to invade with their influence the body of disciples whom He was gathering out of those who flocked to follow Him. "The Jews murmured concerning Him because He said, I am the bread which came down out of heaven." They

murmured at the claim of a Divine origin.

Our Lord's answer was to restate the offer and the claim: "The bread of God is that which cometh down out of heaven and giveth life unto the world," and to restate it now in words which implied, what their rejection of the offer of Life forced upon His own mind, that the life will be given by sacrifice. "The bread which I will give is my Flesh, for the life of the world." When these words provoke fresh questioning He makes this meaning plainer. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in yourselves."[1] And it is on the issue thus raised that His disciples are divided; many of them went back and walked no more with Him.

St John represents our Lord at this point[2] as reluctant to precipitate the issue of the conflict. He went on walking in Galilee.[3]

[1] Cp. Part III., ch. iii., p. 97. [2] St John vii. 1.

[3] The words are "After these things Jesus was walking" or "went on walking in Galilee." (1) It is not implied that this was the beginning of a "walking in Galilee." (2) Galilee,

He refused to come up to the Feast of the Tabernacles with any challenging publicity. When He does come He finds Himself in the midst of the waves of controversy about Himself, controversy between a partial and hesitating popular acceptance—"some say He is a good man"—and the determined rejection of the Jews, determined, as St John expressly tells us, by His having made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath; controversy between Jerusalem and Galilee—"Doth Christ come out of Galilee?" "Art thou also of Galilee?"

In this atmosphere of conflict the irresistible appeal of His words appears to exert a new power: "Never man spake as this man." And it is of the simple and constant needs of spiritual Life that He speaks, as they were symbolised in the ceremonies of the Feast of Tabernacles, in the ritual of the established religion. "If

contrasted for the purposes of the Evangelist with Jerusalem, would very naturally cover the outlying borders towards Tyre and Sidon, through Decapolis, and towards Cæsarea Philippi, the districts of what we have called the Ministry of Flight, after which He began His approach to Jerusalem.

any man thirst let Him come unto Me and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." "I am the Light of the world: he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the Light of Life."

It was in boldly meeting the antagonism provoked by this last saying—the accusation that He bore witness of Himself—that He emphasised the Divine sanction under which He spoke, and the Divine origin and authority which He claimed, and pointed on to their lifting up of the Son of Man as the revelation to the world that He came from the Father. And the antagonism is carried to a new intensity by the fact that these words caused many to believe on Him. For to them that believed He put the crucial test in the offer of the freedom from sin, an offer which made no appeal to those who trusted in themselves as children of Abraham. This, the offer of the freedom from sin, is the word which had not "free course" in them. It was

this which reawakened in them the deadly antagonism, which showed them to be not children of God or children of Abraham, but children of the devil. And it was their resentment at the sense that, as the Giver of Life, He ranked Himself above Abraham which called forth the underlying claim that His Life-giving power flowed from a Divine and Eternal Being. "Before Abraham was, I am." He claims to be one with God, not merely as the author of their own religious institutions, but one in His Eternity with the Eternal God whom in Jehovah the Jews had learnt to know. And it was this final utterance which was followed by the threat of immediate personal attack. "They took up stones to cast at Him."

The moral temper of Our Lord's Divine claim: "I do nothing of Myself," "I can of Myself do nothing"—the humility, which is never so overwhelmingly direct and entire as when the claim is at its height, must have been to them—if we dare attempt to penetrate the secret of their antagonism—essentially repellent. That they should be morally blind

to its attraction is the natural result of their spiritual self-sufficiency—the seal of their spiritual alienation.

We pass on to a stage at which the spiritual conflict deepens into the manifestation of this spiritual alienation, and the offer, as He draws apart from the Jews, takes shape in the picture of the spiritual fellowship from which they are excluding themselves.

§3. *The Life as the Divine Fellowship: The Separation* (Chapters IX. and X.).

From the time of the Feast of Tabernacles the conflict is continuous, but the healing of the man born blind marks a fresh stage in our Lord's manifestation and in the opposition of the Jews, and seems to belong in time as well as in teaching to the events of the Feast of Dedication.

Taking up the thread of teaching from the Feast of Tabernacles, He does the act of healing as the "Light of the world,"[1] and

[1] St John ix. 5.

once more He does it on the Sabbath Day.[1] The Jews "had agreed already that if any man should confess Him to be the Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue,"[2] and accordingly when the man that was born blind will not repudiate his Healer "they cast him out."[3] Our Lord, in inviting and receiving his faith in Himself, makes the inevitable judgment of the Light between those who receive and those who refuse it. And then follow the Parables of the Door of the Sheepfold and of the Good Shepherd. He is contrasting the community from which the man has been cast out with the community into which he has been received. In His indirect rebukes of the rulers He recalls the rebuke of the shepherds in Ezekiel.[4] "The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost." In taking to

[1] St John ix. 14.
[2] St John ix. 22.
[3] St John ix. 34.
[4] Ezekiel xxxiv. 4.

Himself Jehovah's title of the Shepherd of Israel, He contrasts Himself with them, "The thief cometh not, but that he may steal and kill and destroy: I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly." But even more He is picturing the sympathy between the shepherd and the sheep. "The sheep follow him, for they know his voice."[1] "I am the Good Shepherd, and I know Mine own and Mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me and I know the Father, and I lay down My life for the sheep." Beyond the fold of Israel He looks out towards the Gentiles. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold."[2]

For when they challenge Him to tell them plainly whether He is the Christ, He answers that He has told them, and that the works that He does in the Father's name these bear witness of Him. "But ye believe not, because ye are not of My sheep."[3] It is this sense of sheer alienation of spirit from them which has led to His manifestation of

[1] St John x. 4. [2] St John x. 14-16.
[3] St John x. 26.

Himself as the Giver of Eternal Life in the Fellowship of the Love of God. "My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me: and I give unto them Eternal Life; and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of My hand." Finally, He could only justify this sure hold on His own to those who were without by the claim that to this Divine Fellowship He in His own Being belongs. "My Father, which hath given them to Me, is greater than all, and no man is able to snatch them out of My Father's hand. I and My Father are one."[1]

§4. *Conclusion: The Offer vindicated* (Chapter XI.) *and rejected* (Chapter XII.).

The manifestation of Life has been carried to its highest—the Life which finally meets the need of man by admitting him into the Fellowship of the Love of God. Our thoughts have been already directed towards the inner circle of His own. As the end approaches,

[1] St John x. 27-30.

the threads draw together, and the revelation to the Jews, to the people, and to His own tend to coincide. It is in the immediate presence of His own that He makes His final vindication of the offer of Life, in which He declares Himself to be the Resurrection and the Life, in the work which by increasing His popular following brought the antagonism of the Jews to a head. "Many of the Jews which came to hear, and beheld that which He did, believed on Him. But some of them went away to the Pharisees, and told them the things which Jesus had done. The chief priests therefore and the Pharisees gathered a council. . . . So from that day they took counsel that they might put Him to death."[1]

[1] The stages of active antagonism on the part of the Jews seem to be as follows :—

(1.) St John v. — The Evangelist finds here the original motive of mortal enmity, but he does not describe this as the time when any plan was formed or any action taken.

(2.) St John vi. — The Jews follow Him to Galilee. Chapter vii. 1 indicates that during this time the knowledge that the Jews were seeking to kill Him was His motive for walking in Galilee, but it is not suggested that the Jews had taken any action.

(3.) St John vii. and viii. — The chief priests and

St John records our Lord's retirement from the neighbourhood of Jerusalem till the Passover, the stir about Him which caused a gathering to Bethany when He came up there for the Passover and a plot against the life of Lazarus. He tells of the entry of "the King of Israel" into Jerusalem, and of the coming of the Greeks, with the promise of the wider manifestation to come, and then sums up the great rejection with the quotations from the book of the prophet Isaiah, "He hath blinded their eyes and He hardened their heart; Lest they should see with their eyes and perceive with their heart, and should turn, and I should heal them."

Pharisees send officers to take Him, apparently with the purpose of hearing Him and passing judgment upon Him. This stage closes with the impulsive attack provoked by His claim of an Eternal Being.

(4.) St John ix. and x.—It is already determined that if any man should confess Him to be Christ he should be put out of the Synagogue. And at the end of this stage the claim of union with the Father again provokes a passionate assault, and after this the attempt to take Him is renewed.

(5.) St John xi.—The council called on the reception of the news as to the raising of Lazarus is marked as the date of the really final decision.

PART III

THE GOSPEL IN THE MINDS OF THE DISCIPLES

CHAPTER I

THE GROWTH OF APPREHENSION

§1. *After the Summary of the Rejection follows the Final Training of the Apprehension of the Disciples to witness the Issue.*

THROUGHOUT the Gospel thus far, from the first visit to Jerusalem up to the summary of the Rejection, we have been face to face with the world — the world that rejects. Christ and the world have been the persons in the drama. The disciples have been in the background or have been spectators on the scene. Now the world drops away and disappears, and we are alone with Him and

the disciples of His love, and before they witness the issue of the Rejection in His Crucifixion He tells them, as Love can speak to Love, the truths which in time to come will interpret the experience through which they are about to pass.

§2. *The Nature of their Growth of Apprehension illustrated by a Comparison of St John's Account of their Mental Attitude and that of the Three.*

How the experience of a disciple looked to the disciple who recorded it at the time when he recorded it the Gospel tells us. But at this stage we cannot avoid asking ourselves how it looked to the disciples at the time when they passed through it. The Gospel itself suggests that the apprehension of the disciple grew between the time of the events he records and the time when he recorded them. Such a growth of apprehension no doubt plays a large part in the history of the Gospel. There is an apparent contrast between St John and the Three

in this matter of the growth of apprehension. And it will throw light on the general question of the growth of apprehension in the disciples to compare the record of St John with the record of the Three, in order to see whether the two representations of the mental attitude of the disciples to their Lord harmonise into a single picture. The apparent discrepancy between St John and the Three is that he makes the apprehension and acceptance by the disciples of our Lord's personal claim as the Messiah and the Son of God come much earlier in the story than it does in the Galilean Gospels. The true relation to one another of the story of St John and the story of the Three in this matter of the growth of the apprehension by the disciples of our Lord's personal claim on their allegiance, and the true nature of the growth of their apprehension, may perhaps be best seen if we consider the obvious instance of the contrast between the two stories.

§3. *Apparent Contrast between the Two as to the Acknowledgment of our Lord as Messiah.*

In the three Galilean Gospels St Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ," comes, we should say at first sight, as a momentous perception and acknowledgment of our Lord's personal claim, and it comes after the Feeding of the Five Thousand, in the second half of His Ministry, just as He is beginning to teach them to look towards the end.

In St John's Gospel, on the other hand, the words in which St Peter *first* hears of our Lord are the words of his brother St Andrew, "We have found the Christ." The acknowledgment of the Christ appears in the one story as the climax, in the other as the starting-point.

§4. *Reasons why the Acknowledgment should have been held in Check in Galilee.*

In examining the apparent contradiction there are several things to be borne in mind.

The work of the Galilean Ministry was to build up the beginnings of a new spiritual society independent of Judaism. This work needed time. It must not be interrupted by anything which would prematurely provoke that antagonism which He had left Judæa to avoid.

The aim again would not be to evoke but rather to check among His disciples the superficial enthusiasm of loyalty, such as might well among the simple be merely personal. The society of which the Person was the Head must first be formed, its temper and spirit experienced in their fellowship with Him.

To have allowed His works to produce their full and natural effect in focussing popular enthusiasm, to lay premature stress on His personal claim would have defeated both these objects. It would have provoked the conflict with Judaism which it was essential to delay till the new fellowship was formed. It would have excited the minds of His disciples about His personal greatness, when he wished them calmly to

grow into the sense of what His fellowship meant. It would have brought to the front in their minds all the mistaken expectations as to the Messiah which they shared with the mass of the people, when He wished gradually to form in them the mind and character which would enable them, when the critical moment came, to rise to the conception of the suffering Christ.

In Jerusalem the situation was entirely different. There, if the Person of Christ had evoked enthusiasm at all, it would have been the enthusiasm of adherence to the promised King of the Kingdom which was always before their minds. If Jerusalem had accepted Him it was as the King that she was called upon to accept Him. It was at Jerusalem that He did allow Himself to be welcomed as "the King of Israel."[1] It was as the King that she rejected Him. "We have no king but Cæsar." She rejected Him because the religious society of Judaism refused to accept the Spirit by which He would have her to be ruled.

[1] St John xii. 13.

These considerations go to explain why the personal claim was not explicit, and the personal recognition consequently not evoked in the earlier stages in the Galilean Gospels.

§5. *The Galilean Record shows a Virtual Recognition of Messianic Authority from the first, but He was not the Messiah they expected.*

Turn then to the Galilean record. The extreme inference which might be drawn from the contrast between St John and the Three, that the disciples did not recognise our Lord as the Messiah until St Peter's confession, will scarcely stand through even a cursory reading of their story.

Their immediate acceptance of the call by the lake, recorded by St Mark at the very beginning of his story as the first step in the formation of the Galilean fellowship, not merely accords with, but even demands, some previous knowledge of Him, and implies a recognition of a supreme claim

over themselves and their lives. They hear the demoniacs call upon Him as the Son of God, and the recorded impression is that "He suffered them not to speak because they knew that He was the Christ."[1] When He forgives the sins of the paralytic they hear Him accused of blasphemy, *i.e.* of usurping the prerogative of God, and there is no repudiation on His part. He claims that He is the Lord of the Sabbath.[2] He tells them that they, as His disciples, are the salt of the earth, the light of the world. He tells them that He is come to "fulfil" the Law. He claims an equal authority to that with which it was given. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . but I say unto you."

But, on the other hand, we can well imagine that the disciples who had started with the glad recognition, "We have found the Messiah," feeling, as they did, that any public recognition of claims such as His works warranted was checked, were as time went on in somewhat the same state of mind

[1] St Luke iv. 41. [2] St Mark ii. 28.

in which we know St John the Baptist to have been, when he asked, "Art thou He that should come?" only that he had not, what they had, the sense of Christ's present moral and spiritual power over their souls. He was not the Messiah they had expected. There was no sign of His becoming such a Messiah as they expected. They had to learn their lesson afresh. They were learning it by degrees. They had to earn the blessing of those who were not offended in Him, who did not stumble at His being no more than He showed himself to be, who saw in the few miracles of healing and the preaching of the Gospel to the poor, the promise of greater things than these.

Meanwhile they felt themselves gathered into a privileged circle of experience, "Behold My mother and My brethren,"[1] "Unto you it is given to know."[2] And when they are sent out with power to heal, with power over unclean spirits, what are we to imagine that they thought of Him who gave them such authority, even though the

[1] St Mark iii. 34. [2] Luke viii. 10.

enthusiasm of a confession of His personal claim was not yet evoked, till it could carry with it the deeper sense which was growing in them of the Kingdom of which He was the King, of the Spirit with which He, the Christ, was anointed?

§6. *And it is at the Climax of the Trial of their Faith in His Messiahship that the Epoch-making Confession is made.*

What was the time when it was evoked? The great antagonism with the Jews had been developed. The settled Ministry in Galilee had been abandoned. He was on that wider circuit which in one aspect of it was, what it must have eminently seemed to them, a journey of flight. Their hearts might well be failing them. The hopes of that early flash of recognition, in the shape which they must then have taken, had disappeared. He had refused to let them seize Him and make Him king.[1] He had already pointed on to His being a sacrifice, in the

[1] St John vi. 15.

hard saying about giving His flesh for the life of the world, at which many of His disciples turned back and walked no more with Him. They had clung to Him. To His question, "Will ye also go away?" they had answered, "Lord, to whom shall we go, Thou hast the words of Eternal Life, and we have believed and know that Thou art the Holy One of God." This is the time at which the Three record the direct and explicit question and the answer: "Whom say ye that I am?"—"The Christ."

§7. *The Development, then, is in the Deepening of their Apprehension of the Meaning of His Messiahship.*

The result of this survey is to remove the appearance of contradiction between St John and the Three, by showing us the nature of the development in the recognition of Christ by His disciples. The development is the gradual interpretation of the first flash of perception; it is an enrichment of apprehension in the light of an experience

which at once tested and deepened their hold on the truth, and transformed the truth itself which they held.

The process was not over when the great confession was made. Still they could relapse into the old idea of a King on whose right hand and whose left His favoured disciples should sit, of a kingdom to be restored to Israel. When the end came they were still only growing into an apprehension of the meaning of "We have found the Christ," "Thou art the Christ." The growth went on after the Confession. It went on after the Resurrection, after Pentecost. We see it still proceeding in the Acts and in the Epistles of St Paul.

CHAPTER II

THE LESSON OF THE INDWELLING LIFE

§1. *The Deepening of their Apprehension still goes on: St John's Gospel itself is the Climax, and the Chapters before the Passion record one Stage in the Advance.*

It is the latest recorded stage of this growing apprehension of Christ by the disciples of His love which is presented to us by the Gosple of St John, as he records his witness of the great Rejection. And it is one step in advance in this growing apprehension which he records between the record of the Rejection and the record of its issue in the Crucifixion. "Now before the Feast of the Passover, Jesus knowing that His hour was come that He should

depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end."

§2. *Three Times the Disciples come into St John's story:* (1) *Before the Contact with Judaism;* (2) *At the Crisis of the Struggle with Judaism in Galilee;* (3) *Now, as receiving the Final Interpretation of the Offer of Life.*

At three points only does St John touch the story of the training of the disciples.

At the beginning, before the Galilean story, before His first public manifestation at Jerusalem, He pictures the gathering of the first Galilean disciples and the manifestation of His glory to them in the first miracle in Galilee. Against this tender picture stands silhouetted the first dark shadow of the Rejection at Jerusalem.

Again, in the middle of the story, at the Feeding of the Five Thousand, he shows how the influence of Jerusalem, the spirit of the Rejection, invaded the Galilean circle

and threatened the very body of the apostles, and how their faith had grown to a strength which enabled them to stand the strain.

And now, just before the end, He tells how, loving them to the end, He used the hour of parting to reveal to them the secret of the gift of Life which had been offered in vain to the Jews at Jerusalem.

That the purport of this final revelation entered into the life of the Church we know from St Paul's Epistles. That the words spoken were treasured in the loving memory of him who records them, the words themselves would lead us to believe. That their deeper meaning and their bearing on the previous course of teaching at Jerusalem was fully realised by the writer through years of reflection, the record itself would suggest. But in any case, here this body of teaching stands at this particular point in St John's Gospel, commending itself to us as the fuller revelation of that Gospel of Life, which could not be uttered to those who did not believe, and whose spirit at least could be drunk in by those who did

believe and love, until the time should come when the experience of the Christian life should enable the love which retained the memory to discern and unfold the meaning of what was said.

§3. *It is the Revelation to their Love in the Hour of Parting, the Promise of His Indwelling.*

It is the revelation of love to love, the final preparation of those who loved Him for the manifestation of His love in act upon the Cross, which we watch in the last discourses and the final prayer. "I have told you before it come to pass, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe." The spiritual force of apprehension to which He appeals is love, the love belonging to the hour of parting. He tells them that He is going away from them: "Yet a little while am I with you." "Whither I go ye cannot come." Their very souls reach out to cling to Him. They need comfort. What is the substance of the comfort which He gives?

What is the truth which the yearning of their love enables Him to reveal to them? It is summed up in the closing words of the great prayer: "I in them."

§4. *They have learnt* (1) *Dependence on Him as* (2) *the Way and* (3) *the Truth.*

Their desire not to lose their hold on Him is not merely the helpless longing which we know as we stand by those who are passing away from us, the desire to retain the sensible personal presence of those we love. There is more in it than this.

There is the sense of spiritual dependence. They have learnt what they hardly realise that they have learnt — the lesson indeed was but half-learnt, they were to learn it afresh and for ever that night, St Peter when he denied Him, the rest when they forsook Him and fled—they feel, though they do not know, what He presently told them that they might know, that apart from Him they can do nothing.

They have learnt what St Thomas thinks that he has not learnt, but our Lord tells him that he knows it, when He tells him once again what by His presence He has been telling them all the time, "I am the Way." They have learnt the way of righteousness, they have seen the fulfilment of the Eternal Law as it was never learnt or seen by man before.

They have learnt what St Philip asks that he may be shown, though he has seen it all the time, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father," "I am the Truth." God as He is in His Eternal Being has been made known to them.

§5. *He leads them on to the Thought of Him as the Life—the Identification with Himself through the Spirit.*

But He is leading them on beyond these lessons to another. By the force of their yearning desire not to be separated from Him in whom they have found "the Way," the living Law of God, "the Truth," the

vision of the Father's face, He is leading them on to the knowledge of God within them, the Gift of the Spirit, "I in them," "I am the Life."

Towards this need, towards this gift He seems to be guiding them all through the discourse in the Upper Room, afterwards on the way to the Garden, and in the Great Prayer at the end.

They are to regard themselves as identified with Him. The washing of the feet is to teach them that "Ye should do as I have done to you." The new commandment is, "that ye love one another even as I have loved you." The works that He does shall they do also and greater works than these shall they do because He goes to the Father. And if they feel themselves being separated from Him, there where He will be will He prepare a place for them. Whatsoever they shall ask the Father in His Name He will do. And on them thus asking, in the love which strives to keep His commandments, the Prayer of Christ will call down another Comforter, that He may be with them for

ever, the Spirit of the Truth which Christ is—no stranger to them, for while Christ is with them He abideth with them, but when Christ is gone He shall be in them; and in this coming of the Comforter to dwell in them Christ Himself comes to them to give them the Life which He is, "I will come to you, because I live, ye shall live also." "He that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love Him and will manifest Myself to Him." "We will come unto Him and make our abode with Him." And He who records the words records the promise too, of which the record itself was the fulfilment, "He," the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, "shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said to you."

So again, when they are passing from the Upper Room to the Garden, the teaching of the figure of the Vine is "Abide in Me and I in you." "Ye cannot bear fruit except ye abide in Me." "If ye keep My commandments ye shall abide in My Love." "This is My commandment, that ye love

one another, even as I have loved you." And from this identification of themselves with Him it follows that the world will hate them as it hated Him, as in Him it had both seen and hated both Him and His Father. But once more, in the thought of their continuation of His conflict with the world, He recurs to the gift of the Spirit which is to be their strength. "The Comforter, the Spirit of Truth, shall bear witness of Me, and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning." They are not to be offended, not to stumble at persecution. The Comforter will come and will reprove, convict the world. . . . Even as He spoke they must have felt that what He was saying was but a beginning. So He says, 'I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now." By the Spirit He would say them. "When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all truth. He shall take of Mine and show it unto you." And so though for a little while they should have sorrow,

in a little while "Ye shall see Me." "Your sorrow shall be turned into joy, and your joy no man taketh from you."

And once more, in the Great Prayer, He lifts up His eyes to the Father, whom He has glorified by giving to them Eternal Life, which is the knowledge of Him. "I pray for them." "Sanctify them in the truth. For their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth," that the purpose with which He made known to them the Father might be fulfilled in them, "that the Love wherewith Thou lovedst Me may be in them, and I in them."

§6. *The Hour of Parting enabled them to drink in the Spirit of His Teaching, and in that Strength to go through the Dark Hour.*

As we trace even one thread of thought through these last discourses and the final Prayer, we cannot help wondering how far those who heard them were able, as they

heard, to understand. If the full meaning of the words was long in coming home even to him who records them, the experience of that hour of pain and love, of promise and desire, would remain with them—promise which touched, they would feel, the very heart of their desire.

It is said of the Three, whom He took apart with Him while He prayed in the garden, that they slept for sorrow. George Tinworth in picturing the scene has scratched, in the plaster in which he worked, beneath the sleeping St John, "I sleep, but my heart waketh." We, as we read such records as these, feel of ourselves that there is a soul within the soul which carries us beyond the words, though it is the words that interpret to us what we feel. It was this living experience of the Love of Jesus Christ in the hour of parting, giving the promise of His perpetual Presence through the gift of the Spirit, which St John interpreted to Himself and to the Church by the record of the words, when Jesus was glorified and the Spirit

was come. It was through the spiritual discipline of this experience that He passed to witness the Judgment and the Death.

CHAPTER III

THE ISSUE OF THE REJECTION

§1. *The Record of the Judgment and the Death is Bare Fact; the Rest of the Gospel is the Comment. From the first the Death was in View.*

THE actual record of our Lord's Judgment and Death in St John's Gospel is a record of bald hard fact. He omits details, which had already been recorded, and which must be assumed to make his story intelligible. He adds details, such as the knowledge of the man who was known unto the high priest enabled him to add to the story of the trial, and such as the memory of him who stood by the Cross enabled him to add to the story of the Crucifixion—and here alone, in the record of the fare-

well words to Mary and to himself does he seem for a moment to unbend from the rigid horror of his record. But it is bare fact throughout, fact which is left to speak for itself, as we feel it spoke to him, poignant fact, as when "one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water, and he that saw it bare record." It is naked fact, there is almost no comment. The rest of the Gospel is the comment—the story of the manifestation of love in the offer of Eternal Life through the Son of God to those who rejected it, as it was witnessed by His own, whom having loved, He loved to the end. And in the rest of the Gospel the Death, the Crucifixion, the Sacrifice, are in view from the first.

§2. *As the Sacrifice*; (*a*) *Behold the Lamb of God*; (*b*) *The Bread which I will give is My Flesh*; (*c*) *Greater Love hath no man than this.*

The Sacrifice is in view as the manifestation of Love to His own, to the disciples.

They are first drawn to Him by the words of the Baptist, "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" suggesting to the minds of those who heard them the Lamb that was offered in the morning and in the evening, day by day continually, on the altar in the Temple, and the Paschal Lamb offered at the Passover in memory of the great deliverance, and the prophecy of Him who was to be "led as a lamb to the slaughter," whose soul God was to make "an offering for sin," thoughts and memories full of deep meaning to those who, as disciples of the Preacher of repentance, had learnt the knowledge of sin.

It was in their own Galilee, and when they were round about Him, that He told how the Bread that He would give, was His flesh—for the life of the world, and except they ate the flesh of the Son of Man and drank His Blood they had no life in themselves—words which to a Jew could only point to His death as a sacrifice, and to the appropriation of the sacrificed Life. These

were the words which made many of His disciples go back and walk no more with Him. They mark a crisis of the attachment of the disciples to their Lord. It was of these words that St Peter said: "Thou hast the words of Eternal Life."

And again at the end, when the words He had spoken at the Feast of Dedication were yet fresh in their hearts, "I know Mine own and Mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me and I know the Father, and I lay down My life for the sheep," when, having loved His own, He loved them to the end, He said, "This is My commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

§3. *As the "Lifting Up," associated with the Manifestation of the Father's Love, and the Attraction of the World: (a) In the Talk with Nicodemus; (b) In the Conflict at the Feast of Tabernacles; (c) At the Coming of Greeks.*

And, as the Sacrifice has been in view throughout the story of the manifestation of Love, the Crucifixion has been in view throughout the story of the manifestation to those who reject Him. Three times the phrase recurs of which St John says: "This He said, signifying what death He should die." "The Son of Man shall be lifted up," "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man," "I, if I be lifted up from the earth." And the "lifting up" of the Son of Man seems to be associated on the one hand with the manifestation of the Father, and on the other hand, with the thought that, in this lifting up, through the greater manifestation of Love, their rejection will give to Him the new and larger Israel of those who will be drawn to Him and will receive Him.

First, in the talk with Nicodemus, which shows us the secret of the rejection of the Jews, that they felt no need of spiritual renewal, when He is saying to him, "If ye believe not" this, "how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" He goes on, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in Him may have Eternal Life. For God so loved the world, that He gave His only Begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have Eternal Life."

And again, at the Feast of Tabernacles, when He is telling them that the things which He has heard "from Him" these speaks He to the world, and they perceive not that He is speaking to them of the Father, He adds, "When ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am He, and that I do nothing of Myself, but as the Father taught Me I speak these things." And St John describes how even among "the Jews" the intrinsic attraction of the words was felt, "As He spake these

words many believed on Him" — though they were not to "abide in His word."

And once more at the end of the great drama of rejection, before that appalling summary which closes the twelfth chapter of the Gospel, now when His manifestation to "His own" is finally closing in, "His own" receiving Him not, and, like a ray of light flashing out into the darkness, the coming of the Greeks to seek Him gives promise of the gathering in of the Gentiles, He breaks out, "The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified. Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit;" and when the prayer, "Father, glorify Thy Name," is answered by the voice from heaven, He adds, "Now is the judgment of this world, and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to Myself."

If throughout the story of the Gospel the manifestation of Love seems to be cut off from its fruit and result, because it leads to nothing but rejection, here it is not so.

Here light begins to break. Here we reach the positive issue, the positive result. The final manifestation of Love, to which the great rejection leads, must draw all men to itself. This is how the whole story of the rejection shines with a strange glory to St John, the glory of the manifestation in which it was to end. And this is the light in which, in the bare record of St John, the Judgment and the Crucifixion stand out.

§4. *The Kingdom which is Rejected is the Kingdom of the Truth, the Truth of the Manifested Love of God.*

This is the New Kingdom, the Kingdom of those who are drawn. He had entered Jerusalem amid the shouts of a crowd, who welcomed Him as the King of Israel. Was He a King? Pilate asked. The answer was that He came to bear witness to the Truth, and every one that was of the Truth heard His voice. That was the nature of His kingdom, the kingdom of those who were drawn by the attraction of the Love manifested as the Truth. From this kingdom

the Rulers of the Jews disinherited themselves, when they found themselves driven by their repudiation of Him to say: "We have no king but Cæsar."

The power of the Roman Empire was given to it from above, it was ordained by the power that orders all things, as the Prophets had always taught that the powers that be are ordained of God. Those who delivered our Lord to Pilate had the greater sin, because they, the representatives of that Higher Power, had failed to recognise in Him the Mind of God, had failed to see in Him the Christ, the King of the spiritual Israel, and therefore had misused and perverted to compass His destruction the earthly empire which was the instrument of the Divine Righteousness.

Pilate, the stages of whose struggle not to surrender Roman justice to the ill-will of the Jews St John so mercilessly and minutely records, finally flings Him to them with a taunt, "Behold, your King!" unconscious of the irony of his condemnation of them and of himself.

§5. *It is Hard Fact, as he, the Disciple, then saw and felt the Fact.*

The scene in itself is a scene of sheer and hard rejection. In every detail of it we feel at once the blind unconsciousness of those who knew not what they did, and yet their clear knowledge of the moral issue as presented to their conscience, half-enlightened as it was. As a mere crime it was a clear-sighted and deliberate crime. It is wonderful to think that this is the scene whose issue was described beforehand in the words: "I will draw all men to Myself."

But as it is called up before us we see it through his eyes, who records it as he saw it when he wrote the record. Who can say with what eyes he saw it then when he saw it. Who can say whether in that hour his mind could travel back over treasured memories of dark prophetic words? Rather perhaps the story as it stands conveys to us the truth. Just so the facts stamped themselves upon his heart, the bare sheer facts, as

to which, as they fell upon his soul, he could neither feel nor think. "Not this man, but Barabbas." "Behold, the Man!"—"Behold, your King!"—"What I have written I have written."—"It is finished."

CHAPTER IV

THE REVEALING FACT

§1. *"They knew not" till at the Sepulchre the Disciple "saw and believed"*

For "as yet they knew not." Sometimes we have known death to be the revealing fact, bringing home to us in a flash the secret of a man's life, the high value at which he is rated, known only when death has rounded his life into a whole. But to them His death was itself a mystery, leaving hopes wrecked, and purposes defeated, and promises unfulfilled. The memories of His deeds and of His words rested like unread riddles in their minds. The burden of wonder and sorrow and pain lay heavy on their hearts.

What was the revealing fact? St John tells us for himself the moment when the new day dawned and the light shot back

over the past, and the secret stood out plain and clear, which is written plain and clear throughout his Gospel—In Him was Life—"These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have Life through His Name." The Resurrection, Life through Death, revealed the secret, when "he saw and believed."

The secret was revealed to Love. Once more the world has dropped away and disappeared. The Resurrection is no part of the revelation to those who rejected Him. For them the Cross was the last word. It is a revelation to those who love. The fact is recorded in the light in which it was apprehended, as the revelation of Eternal Life in the victory of the Living Love over Death.

§2. *He saw—the Negative Fact, not the return to Life, the Old Life was over.*

As yet they knew not. What was it which he saw—and believed? The great

moment was not when He stood in the midst of them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." It was not when they received His message, "I ascend unto My Father and your Father." It was when he saw the empty tomb, and the linen clothes lying, from which the body had departed.

It was a negative fact with which he was face to face. It is no story like the raising of Lazarus. It was not that death had broken in upon the course of life, and then suddenly death had seemed to be only a dream of the night, for the dead had come back to life. It was not that Christ was come back to life. His death was not cancelled, or removed, or done away, or made as though it had not been. The purport of what he saw was like the word of the angel, "He is not here." It was no delusive parting that He had made with them after the supper. He was no longer "with" them, though He manifested Himself to them from time to time. "Touch Me not" marked the character of the Risen

Life. It belonged to the Ascended Life rather than to the earthly life which lay behind.

§3. *He saw—the Linen Clothes lying Empty, revealing Life through Death.*

And this was the convincing thing—the negative fact. This was what he saw, and believed. He saw them lying—the linen clothes—empty of the body which they had enclosed. And, when he followed Simon Peter into the tomb, he saw the napkin which had been about His head, not lying with the linen clothes, but apart, twisted round, away by itself.[1] That which died had passed away into that which lived. Death itself contributed an element in the truth. Life was revealed as Life through Death. In some such way the words indicate that conviction flashed from what he saw. He saw and believed—the reality of the death, the reality of the Resurrec-

[1] The interpretation is that given in Latham's "Risen Master."

tion, the continuity between the life that was and the life that is, and the difference between the life that was and the life that is.

§4. *The Continuity is Vital to the Experience. Death was not an End but a Beginning of the Life that had risen from the Grave-clothes.*

The continuity is vital to the meaning of the experience. He had watched the sinless life, the perfect righteousness, the perfect love. He had seen the rejection grow to hate, and hate threaten and seize and condemn and kill. Death was the utmost it could do. And here in a moment he saw that of that righteousness and love death was not the end. It was a beginning, not an end. It was the beginning of a new and wondrous life which had risen from the grave-clothes where they lay. What this new life was to be they knew not yet. They waited to see.

§5. *They sought no more the Body of the Dead. They waited for and received the Manifestation of the Living.*

They sought no more for the body of Him that was dead. They went back and waited for the manifestation of Him that was alive from the dead.

And word was brought to them by Mary Magdalene that living communion with Him was given back by His manifestation in a bodily form, the means of communion between spirit and spirit like the body of the earthly life, through the lips that had spoken her name, but had forbidden her to lay hold on Him, and had given the promise of a new communion with Him, and with the Father to whom He ascended.

And in the evening suddenly He was among them Himself, breathing on them the promise of the Spirit, which He had told them they should receive from the Father and from Himself, and in whose

power they should give the forgiveness of sins in which their own new life had begun.

§6. *But it was from the Negative Fact that the Disciple dated his Conscious Belief in the Gospel of Eternal Life.*

But as St John looked back, it was to that first hour of the dawn that he looked back. All was rooted in that moment when he saw and believed. As yet they knew not. Now they knew.

And in the light of this new dawn of knowledge he enters on the long years of tarrying till the Master came—the years whose meditative memory gave to us and to the Church the Gospel of Eternal Life.

CONCLUSION

§1. *St John's Gospel challenges Interpretation as a Gospel of Jerusalem, such as the Story of the Three and Intrinsic Probability alike demand.*

It remains to sum the results of this study of the Gospel of St John in its relation to the Three.

Dr Sanday says of the Fourth Gospel ("Criticism of Fourth Gospel," p. 145), that for the particular purpose for which it was written, "Geography did not matter, it was quite indifferent whether the scene was laid in Judæa or in Galilee." I do not think that Dr Sanday would wish to press this statement in any sense in which I should question it. It certainly stands for a truth which I should maintain. And yet I will venture to take the phrase as it

stands, as representing the neglect of the point of view from which we are bound to start in appreciating the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Three.

The first thing to be said is, Geography does matter. Given the mind of the writer of the Fourth Gospel, as it is revealed to us in his Gospel, it is most improbable that to him any element of fact, which challenges attention in his story, is indifferent to the idea which his story presents. The fact that, as he tells us, there was a Gospel preached in Jerusalem, the place which God had chosen to set His name there, in itself asks the questions to which we have endeavoured to suggest the answers.

The Galilean story again, the story of the Three, not only leaves room for, but demands, a story of a Ministry at Jerusalem to supplement and to explain it.

And when once we are brought face to face with the probability that there was a Jerusalem Ministry and a Jerusalem Gospel, as it is suggested by the Three that there

was, we see that the supposition that there was such a Ministry and such a Gospel has an intrinsic probability of its own, almost amounting to a moral and spiritual necessity. The main object of the Fourth Gospel, it is true, is beyond place or history, but it is quite inseparable from place and history, and to leave place or history out of account is, in part at least, to lose touch with the deepest truth of the Gospel itself.

§2. *It is the Gospel of Eternal Life in the Son of God, the Universal Need of Man, which the Jew had been Divinely prepared to receive.*

The main object of the Gospel is to record in its full meaning the offer of Eternal Life, as rooted in the Divine and Eternal character of Him who made the offer. But this teaching of Eternal Life was at once, and for the same reasons, the Gospel which the Jew, the instructed Jew, the Jew of Jerusalem, ought to have received

with eager and sympathetic welcome, and the life, at first the unconscious life, later the conscious faith and life of that universal human fellowship in God, which grew out of the society founded in Galilee.

There are passages in the record of the Three, the record of the founding of this fellowship, which presuppose or lead up to the deeper teachings as to the Divine Life given to men, with which the later chapters of St John's Gospel finally present us.[1] But it is St John who records the manifestation of that Eternal Life, of that gift of the Divine Life in man, whose growing fruition we watch in the Church of the Epistles. And he records it as the offer made to the Jews in the home of Jewish religion, and commended to them by appeals to the inner spirit of the Law and the Prophets.

When He demands of the teacher of Israel the knowledge of the need of a new spirit and a new life, He demands that Israel should have learnt to long for the high promise of Jeremiah and Ezekiel,

[1] St Matthew x. 40, xviii. 20, xxviii. 20; St Luke xi. 13.

the promise of the new heart and the new spirit which God would put within them. He challenges acceptance as the Life-giving Deliverer in the name of the God of the Sabbath. The Bread, the Water, the Light of Life, are offers, all of them, that carry back to the inspiration of the history whose memories they treasured. As the Shepherd He takes up the threads of history and psalm and prophecy that lead, through the memories of deliverance and fostering care, to thoughts of the ties of tender and intimate fellowship by which God was bound to His people. He appeals to the need, the human need, of God, as it had been developed, in God's providence, in Israel, the religious protagonist of humanity. To the Israelite the ideas, the experiences, were familiar history by which the sense of this need should have been bred.

To them whom the Love of God had thus prepared, the Love of God must thus and no otherwise be manifested, because no otherwise could the Love of God to

man be manifested, than through His Love, His "Dilectio," of the people of His choice. Only through the manifestation of this Love to them, and its rejection, could the force of Love that lay behind the manifestation be shewn forth, the force which brought out of the very material of the rejection the greater manifestation of Love. The need of the new Life, the need of deliverance and healing, the hunger and the thirst for God, the longing for the Light —in answer to all these, as they cried aloud in the records of Jewish religious aspiration, the Presence of God among His people, at the heart and home of their religious life, must be manifested to satisfy these needs.

§3. *Rejected by the Jew, interpreted in its Fulness to the Disciple as the Gospel of the Indwelling Life.*

And so far the manifestation could and must be made even to those who rejected the Divine offer, although it was to be—

in a sense even in order that it might be —rejected. But how the need was to be satisfied, by what gift of the Divine Indwelling, by what spiritual union with Him who made the offer — this could only be told to the disciples of His Love. To one among these, who, belonging to the company of the Galilean fellowship, had watched with amazement and horror the growing tragedy of rejection, it was given to learn, before its consummation, in the hour of parting, that Gospel within the Gospel, that communication of the Divine Life to man, by the gift of which alone the need of God, in which the Jewish spirit had been trained, would find the satisfaction of its hope, and in after years to enter into the full meaning of what he learnt. In his story the manifestation which was rejected passed on into and is fused with the manifestation which is received. He interprets the Gospel of the Rejection, as it could only be interpreted in the light given to the love of the disciple. He brings to illuminate the disciple's faith

and the disciple's experience the memory of the great rejection of the manifestation of Love.

§4. *Whose Manifestation is the Act of the Eternal Word by Whom all Things were made.*

And the scene of that manifestation and of that rejection becomes to him the central scene of the drama of the creation of God. We are in the presence of the great necessities of the Divine Being. As it is the Divine Fellowship, the fruit of the Divine Indwelling, which has come to satisfy the inspired and instructed need of man, so it is the Eternal Word, the expression of the Divine mind and the Divine will, by whose agency all things were made, and man that he might receive the Light of Life, the shining forth of whose glory the disciple has seen, the light shining in the darkness of humanity, the God who had chosen Sion to be His own coming to His own and His own

receiving Him not, but as many as received Him, Him who was rejected by His own, receiving the sonship to God, which was the living experience of the Christian Life.

PART IV

SUPPLEMENTARY ILLUSTRATIONS

In the foregoing chapters a view of the relation of St John's Gospel to the Three has been set forth in relation to three main points of difference between them, (1) the difference as to the scene of the Ministry, (2) the difference as to the development of the teaching as to our Lord's Person, (3) the difference as to the development of the disciples' apprehension of the Master's claim. It may help to illustrate the view set forth if we indicate its bearing on some of the less obvious differences between St John and the Three; viz.—(1) The omissions in the one story of incidents told in the other,

such as we should expect to be told in the story from which we find them to be omitted; and with these we may note the different light in which the Ministry of the Baptist is presented: (2) The different place taken by the miracles in the two narratives: (3) The different impression as to our Lord left upon our minds by the one story and the other, the different picture of His Person and character.

CHAPTER I

INCIDENTS OMITTED AND INSERTED BY ST JOHN AND BY THE THREE

§1. *The Biographical Fallacy.*

As to the difference in the events recorded or omitted in St John's Gospel and the Galilean Gospels, it would clear the ground for the consideration of the question, if we could banish from our minds in relation to the Gospels all the associations suggested by the word "biography." Even the phrase "Life of our Lord" suggests a completeness of knowledge which we do not possess, and an aim which was altogether absent from the minds of the Evangelists.

St Mark's Gospel opens with the words: "the Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ," and its first mention of our Lord

tells how He came into Galilee preaching the Gospel of God, and saying: "The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand." Here is no suggestion of the beginning of a biography. The book is written at a time when "The Gospel" is a well-known thing. It is realised and embodied in a Christian fellowship, whose life and faith is pictured to us in the earlier Epistles of St Paul. Writing in the midst of this society the Evangelist gives the record of its origin. It is the story of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, not the story of Jesus Christ.

The preface of St. Luke's Gospel gives a similar and more detailed description of his object. He is undertaking, as many others have done, to draw up a narrative "concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us," that Theophilus may know the certainty concerning the things wherein he was instructed. And, for the purpose of doing this, he has traced the course of all things from the first, and has gone to those as his sources

who delivered these things, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word. Drawing on other sources besides those open to St Mark, he has also presented a different aspect of the story. Comparing his Gospel with St Mark's we can see that the mind of the author was possessed by an aspect of the Gospel, and that with the view of presenting this aspect he selects the incidents on which he shall dwell, and the details which he shall emphasise. This pre-occupation with the presentation of an aspect of the Gospel is such as to exclude all idea of the completeness of a biography, even in a Gospel which, like St Luke's, prefixes to the ceremonious opening of the history of the Ministry, the stories of the birth, and of the scene in the boyhood of Jesus.

St Matthew's Gospel is even further removed from a biography than the Gospels of St Mark and St Luke. The grouping of events, the pre-occupation with the idea of the kingdom, and with the fulfilment of

the law and the prophets, are sufficient to make this plain. We have once more the story of the beginning of the Gospel in one aspect of it. As "the generations" of Terah or of Isaac or of Jacob introduced a chapter in God's dealings with His chosen people, so "the Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of Abraham, the Son of David" is the final chapter in this history.

St John's Gospel itself implies and alludes to these earlier records of the beginning of the Gospel, and chooses the events to be dwelt on with a view to its own peculiar purpose, covering the same ground as they did only when the particular event to be recorded subserves that purpose.

The question is then—Does St John omit any event recorded by the Three, which from the point of view of his purpose we should have expected him to insert, and do the Three omit any event recorded by St John, which from the point of view of their purpose we should expect them to insert?

We may briefly indicate in particular instances the bearing of the clear recognition of the purpose of the Gospel on the answer to be given to these questions.

§2. *The Virgin Birth.*

The special point of difficulty in this case is that there are two passages in St John[1] in which Jesus is spoken of as the Son of Joseph, and that there is no correction. The speakers are (1) Philip, immediately after his call, (2) the Jews at Capernaum. The words used are natural on any hypothesis in the mouths of those who used them. As to correction by our Lord, which was possible only in the second case, the Virgin Birth does not appear in St Matthew or St Luke as part of the initial Gospel deliverance. It appears as an affix to the Gospel of the Fellowship, a truth for the enlightenment of the believer, never as a means of winning belief. We should not therefore expect any allusion to it by our

[1] St John i. 45 ; vi. 42.

Lord. As to correction by the Evangelist, if, as the Fourth Gospel itself implies, it was written for a church which already possessed the other Three, it would have been quite unnecessary for his readers' sake that he should break in upon the strain of reminiscence to supply a correction of a form of speech, which would not strike them as unnatural in the mouths of those who used it, a correction which, if it had been needed, they would almost unconsciously and as a matter of course supply of their own accord.

If it seem strange that there should be no allusion to the Virgin Birth in St John, with whose Gospel of the Incarnation it so readily harmonises, the explanation lies in the fact that St John is throughout recalling his recollection of what Jesus said, and that, if he expands his recollection according to his fuller appreciation of the meaning, there is no sign that he adds to it, in the sense that he is otherwise than true to his recollection of the *subjects* on which our Lord spoke.

§3. *The Ministry of St John the Baptist*

is very differently recorded. The difference of purpose is clear. In the Galilean Gospels we have a picture of John's *Ministry* as the beginning of the Gospel. In St John we have a record of the *witness* of John, (1) as the first step in the manifestation to the rejecting Jews; (2) as giving our Lord the nucleus of the body of disciples.

In the former case we are told how, according to the prophecy, (1) John came and baptized and preached (2) the baptism of repentance, and (3) there went out unto Him the country of Judæa and all they of Jerusalem; (4) how he foretold another greater than himself, (5) Who should baptize with the Holy Ghost; (6) how Jesus came to him from Galilee and was baptized; and (7) how the Spirit came down upon Him and the voice from heaven said, "Thou art My Beloved Son." In St John, with the one exception of (6) the actual Baptism of Christ, these are all alluded to, viz., (1)

"Why *baptizest* thou?" (2) "Behold, the Lamb of God, that *taketh away* the *sin* of the world"; (3) "The Jews sent unto him from Jerusalem"; (4) "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose"; (5) "He baptizeth with the Holy Spirit"; (7) "I beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven, and it abode upon Him," and "I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God." But the allusions are incidental to St John's own purpose. He is not professing to give the story of the Baptism or of the Ministry of St John the Baptist. He is recording the witness of John, first, the negative witness, "I am not the Christ"; secondly, the prophetic announcement, "There standeth One among you whom ye know not"; (3) The positive witness to Jesus, as (*a*) the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin, (*b*) the final cause of His own Ministry—"that He should be made manifest to Israel, for this cause came I baptizing with water," (*c*) the recipient of the visible descent of the Spirit, in virtue of which he recognises Him as the Son of

God. The actual Baptism of Jesus (6) is notable when we are considering the Ministry of St John the Baptist as introductory to our Lord's. It has no special connection with his witness to Christ. The allusion to the preaching of repentance (2) takes the form of the designation of our Lord as taking away sin, through which the first disciples became attached to Jesus. The attachment of these disciples is a main element in St John's story. The designation is first public and ineffective, afterwards private and effective on the two disciples who heard. This is in accordance with the whole record of the Gospel, in which the general rejection is contrasted with the sympathetic belief of the few. So it is here: the general rejection in spite of John's witness is contrasted with the belief of the few as arising out of John's witness. The descent of the Holy Spirit (7) in the form of a dove is mentioned as witnessed by the Baptist, and the designation as the Son of God is given, not as spoken by the voice from heaven, but as echoed from

that voice by the Baptist's witness and acknowledgment. Considering the complete difference of purpose between the two stories, the amount of explicit agreement in detail is matter of surprise.

As to the broad difference in the spirit of the picture of the Baptist, this is more than sufficiently accounted for by the fact that in St John we have the picture of the Baptist by a disciple who entered most deeply into his teaching and who was one of those through whom the Ministry of the Baptist did actually lead on to the Ministry of Christ. The general fact that it did thus prepare the way is stated by the Three. The general statement could not be true unless there had been some such inner story of detailed actual connection as St John has given us.

The suggestion that, if John had made the complete declaration of faith which is ascribed to him by St John, he would have become a disciple of Jesus seems to overlook (1) the prophetic character of the utterances of John—they represent moments

of inspiration, of insight, of enthusiasm, and (2) the very varying significance of the title, the Son of God. And, as a point of contrast between St John and the Three, this suggestion seems to be sufficiently met by the reminder that according to the Three the voice from heaven would seem to have been heard by the Baptist.

§4. *The Temptation*

has no obvious connection with the Ministry recorded by St John, and, on our general view of what regulates the choice of incidents to be recorded, there was no reason to expect its inclusion.

§5. *The Institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*

finds its place very naturally in the history of the Fellowship, but it played no part in the preparation, through the sorrow of the parting, for the gift of the Spirit and His indwelling presence, and it is of this that

the story of these chapters in St John is the record.

§6. *The Agony*

in the Garden is omitted in St John, and on the same principle its inclusion was not to be expected.

§7. *The Incidents connected with the Crucifixion*

present several differences. The cry of desolation on the Cross is omitted in St John as in St Luke. The words recorded by St John are, (1) the words which mark the final parting in earthly intercourse from the disciple himself, and (2) the words which mark the consummation of the great conflict and of the sacrifice in which the rejection issued, with the words "I thirst" which led up to these. The rending of the veil of the Temple would not have come naturally among the vivid experiences of the eye-witness of the Crucifixion. The piercing of

the side was not a detail which need have been recorded by the Three. Its inclusion in St John's record is characteristic of the brooding imagination of the writer, who seems like a man habitually silent and reserved, whose imagination is liable to be kindled to the point of utterance by some vivid and appealing fact.

§8. *The Doubt of St Thomas*

is not the only distinctive feature of St John's story of the Resurrection, but it is the most marked addition to the record of the Three. It seems a natural account of its inclusion that it is recorded for the sake of the confession to which it leads, and that it is intended, in accord with "he saw and believed," to show how the actual resurrection, manifest to sense, was the means by which the disciples were led to the full recognition of the Divine Christ, believing on Whom they had life. Its omission by the Three is in harmony with the general character of the Resurrection

stories, which show no attempt at a complete record, and give vivid pictures of appearances, such as fit in with the purpose and spirit of each Gospel.

§9. *The Record of the Miracles.*

There remain the differences in the record of *the miracles*.

(*a*) Of the *miracles recorded by the Three*, but *not recorded by St John*, there are none which would have any particular claim for insertion in his story. The raising of Jairus' daughter, and of the widow of Nain's son, as miracles of raising the dead, might seem to have a claim for insertion in the Gospel of Life. But, when we realise that St John's story is the story of the manifestation to the Jews at Jerusalem, we feel that their inclusion in this story would have been almost impossible. As to the omission of all miracles of casting out demons, it is to be remembered that the miracles recorded by St John are very few in number, that those that are recorded are chosen evidently,

not for their own sakes, but as marking steps or epochs in the development of the antagonism of the Jews, and that there is no sign of their being intended to be representative of the healing of different kinds of disease, *e.g.*, there is in St John no healing of the deaf and dumb, or of the leper. There would be no particular appropriateness to St John's purpose in any of these three classes of miracles. And the fact that no miracle of any of these classes marked a stage or a crisis in our Lord's manifestation and rejection at Jerusalem is not in itself at all surprising.

(*b*) *Galilean miracles recorded by St John.* —The Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Walking on the Sea *are* recorded in St John, although they occurred in Galilee, and are also recorded by the Three, because they were the events leading up to the discourse on the Bread of Life, with the substance of which the former, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, is also connected. And this discourse, as we have indicated above, we believe to be included in St

John's Gospel, because it represents the antagonism of the Jews of Jerusalem following our Lord into Galilee (see above, p. 13).

(*c*) Of the *miracles recorded by St John* and *omitted by the Three* there are three that call for notice, two because they occurred in Galilee, and the third because of its special character.

The Turning of the Water into Wine plainly dwelt in St John's mind as connected with the dawn of belief in our Lord in the inner circle of the disciples. He notes that it is part of the proem to the story. His hour was not yet come. It occurred in Galilee, but before the imprisonment of John, which is given by the Galilean Gospels as the date of the public beginning of that Ministry in Galilee which it is their business to record.

The Healing of the Nobleman's Son again dwelt in St John's mind, perhaps partly as in fact the first miracle in Galilee on His return there to begin His Ministry, but mainly as an example of the Galilean temper, that sense of imperative need

which made Galilee the place of the manifestation. To the Three it had no such importance. It perhaps preceded the beginning of the public preaching in Galilee. In any case it is merely one of the many miracles of Christ which are not recorded by them in detail. They record certain representative miracles which left their mark upon the mind, and dwelt in the memory, and helped forward the apprehension of the disciples.

The Raising of Lazarus.—The omission of this miracle by the Three seems to deserve special consideration. It is closely connected with the final catastrophe at Jerusalem. They record the catastrophe. Why do they not record a miracle which, according to St John, did so much to precipitate the issue? The answer to be given to this question does not perhaps altogether overcome our surprise at the omission.

In St John's record the story is of the first importance. It is the climax of the manifestation in works, and it brings the

antagonism to a point. But it is to be observed that its importance in St John is altogether relative to the conflict with the Jews at Jerusalem. Primarily, therefore, its omission by the Three is no more surprising than their omission of the other incidents of the Jerusalem Ministry. St John in his Gospel is giving the history of the development of the antagonism of the Jews at Jerusalem. The Three take this antagonism for granted from the first. The mere wonderfulness of the miracle is no reason for its being recorded by any one. The miracles recorded by the Three are recorded as part of the manifestation which fashioned the original fellowship of believers. This miracle formed no part of the cycle of events which brought about this result. It was done, as our Lord said, that they might believe in His Life-giving power. But its main historical importance to the Evangelist lay in the fact that it caused certain of the Jews, who had come to Mary, to believe, and thereby led to the final Council.

These considerations go some way to meet the difficulty. They do not, perhaps, altogether do away with our surprise that a miracle, which did have an important effect in confirming the faith of the disciples, and which was closely connected with the one part of the Jerusalem Ministry with which the Three concern themselves, namely, its catastrophe, should not have been included in their story of the catastrophe.

(*d*) *Necessary Imperfection of Explanations.* —This is perhaps pre-eminently the case to which a consideration applies with which we may close this survey of discrepancies. As we follow such a survey, it is difficult to resist the reflection that, in literary documents of the character we have described, we are not likely to be able to give an exhaustive and complete account of the motives which dictate the inclusion and exclusion of every particular incident. Who that recalls the actual process of his own mind as he writes, could undertake to unravel the complexity of the motives under which this or that feature in that which

finally stands written has flashed into his mind, and found its way on to the paper? The most we can expect is that we should find, as we do, that the events recorded and omitted harmonise generally with the obvious purpose of the story.

CHAPTER II

THE VIEW OF THE MIRACULOUS IN ST JOHN AND IN THE THREE.[1]

§1. *The Distinctive Purpose of the Gospel the Leading Consideration.*

THE different place taken by miracles in the story of St John and in the story of the Three has been alleged as a discrepancy which tends to discredit the historical character of St John's Gospel. If we look at the miraculous element in St John in the light of the view we have taken of the distinctive purpose of the Gospel, such discrepancy as can fairly be alleged is explained.

[1] The view here controverted is for the most part that which is to be found stated in the section on "The signs of Jesus," in the first chapter of Wendt's Gospel according to St John.

§2. *Modern Ideas of the Miraculous must be Eliminated.*

But it is necessary first to recall in reference to the interpretation of St John the meaning or meanings of the words for which the English word miracle stands. And, at the very beginning of the consideration of any question about miracles in relation to the interpretation of any ancient literary document, it is never superfluous to recall the necessity of ridding our minds as far as possible of the associations which the word miracle has acquired in modern controversy. This caution applies, for instance, to the modern idea of the miracle as "contrary to nature." These may be very natural words for *us* to use in describing to ourselves one element in the ancient meaning of the words used for "miracle." But the notion of contrariety to nature is essentially modern, and the application of this idea to the interpretation of any ancient document is unhistorical, if we allow ourselves to mean that it was

as "contrary to nature" that the miracle appealed to the consciousness of men in the times when the Gospels were written. No less foreign to ancient ideas is the notion of the miracle which used to appear in apologetic literature, and still sometimes survives in the literature of attack on traditional ideas, where the miracle appears as the premiss of an argument of the character, "This is a supernatural work, therefore the man who did it must bear a Divine character." The modern argument of this character, besides introducing the modern idea of the supernatural, isolates the evidential force of the element of "wonder" in a miracle, in a way in which, as we shall see, it was not isolated in ancient times. There is no trace in St John or anywhere else in the Gospels of the argument, This is a wonderful, *i.e.*, a supernatural work, therefore, because of its sheer wonderfulness, of its merely supernatural character, the doer of it must be Divine.

§3. *Words for "Miracle" used by St John.*

This will appear more clearly if we look at St John's use of the different words which were used for miracle. The four words which are used are not parallel or alternative descriptions of the thing, but successive stages in the apprehension of its meaning and character.

"Wonder" (τέρας) was the first aspect under which the miracle appeared. "Miracle" is the English equivalent of this first phase of apprehension. A further stage is reached when it is realised that the thing done excited wonder because of the *power* shown in it, and the miracle was spoken of as a "mighty work" (δύναμις). It is a further stage still when the wonderful work of power is seen to be a "sign" (σημεῖον), pointing to something beyond itself, pointing to the person who did it, directing attention to His character and His teaching. Lastly, when He is known, and His character in some measure understood, it is looked

at no longer from the point of view of the observer, but from the point of view of the doer, which has now become the point of view of the believer. It is a "work" (ἔργον), the natural outcome of His person and character.

St John uses the word "wonder" *once*. It is at the very beginning of the Ministry in Galilee, when the primary aspect of the miracle was naturally prominent, and already our Lord is wishing to lead them on beyond it, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." The words are a reproach to evoke the expression of the need of help which led to the doing of the miracle. He uses the term "mighty work" not at all. The two words he does use are "sign," and "work."

The question as to St John's distinctive view of miracles really turns on his use of "sign." The first thing to be said then is that on the face of it there is no justification, unless the context supplies it, for emphasising the idea of wonder in St John in connection with the miracle. It is quite

true that the sign *is* wonderful. So also is the work wonderful. Our Lord says: "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin." The unusual character of the work was a part of that which made it a sign. Wonder is a part of the significance of the sign. But it is only a part and it cannot fairly be separated from the moral and spiritual significance of the work. There are not two things, (1) a wonder which makes you believe in the doer of it, (2) a quasi-allegorical meaning, a spiritual significance. The work is a wonderful work of love and mercy. It is as a wonderful work of love that it makes men come to Him. That is how it should be effective as a sign. They should have come to Him because they saw the signs. It should point on beyond itself to the Divine pity and love manifest in Him. It is thus significant to those who appreciate the moral and spiritual significance, not to those who do not. This is how the miracle plays its part, as in the story of the gather-

ing of the fellowship in Galilee, so in St John's story of the appeal of our Lord to the Jews of Jerusalem and His rejection by them.

§4. *Privacy and Publicity of Miracles.*

The contrast suggested between St John and the Three is that, with the Three, the miracle is primarily a work of compassion, in St John it is primarily a wonder to support a Divine claim. To strengthen this contrast stress has been laid on the privacy of the miracles recorded by the Three, as contrasted with the publicity of the miracles in St John. We have already seen that our Lord's desire to limit the publicity of His work, as an appeal to mere wonder and superficial enthusiasm, is incidental to the purpose of the Galilean Ministry. Beyond what this motive explains, the privacy of the Galilean miracles cannot, I think, be made good.

The man with the unclean spirit[1] is

[1] St Mark i. 21.

healed publicly in the Synagogue. The sick who were healed[1] "at even when the sun did set," were healed publicly. The leper[2] was told not to publish his cure, but there is nothing to show that he was healed privately. The paralytic, whose story illustrates the inseparability of the spiritual significance from the wonder of a miracle, was certainly not healed privately. Jairus' daughter[3] was raised in the presence of a select few, but the circumstances, as a matter of fact, ensured publicity. The deaf man[4] was taken aside from the multitude for the act of healing, but the multitude were there, and He charged *them* that they should tell no man. The blind man[5] is led out of the village and told not to return to it: but the object of the privacy may be naturally supposed to be here, as necessarily in the previous instances, the limitation of publicity to those who, being nearly concerned, would

[1] St Mark i. 32.
[2] St Mark i. 40.
[3] St Mark v. 37.
[4] St Mark vii. 33.
[5] St Mark viii. 23.

not be affected by mere wonder without spiritual appreciation. There is nothing to put on His withdrawal from publicity the interpretation that He would not be sought after and believed for the sake of "the miraculous," so long as we mean by "the miraculous," the miraculous works of mercy and healing. If it had been true that He would not be believed for the sake of "the miraculous" in any sense beyond this, why should He do miracles at all? Why should He not avoid doing what seemed to be wonderful? When He was asked for a sign from heaven He refused it, but it was part of the substance of His Ministry to give signs on earth, as He said in the leading case of the paralytic, the first miracle which provoked Pharasaic antagonism: He did it "that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins."

§5. *Review of the Miraculous in St John.*

It is neither necessary nor natural that our Lord's use of miracles and His

demeanour in doing them should be the same in the two entirely different atmospheres of Galilee and Jerusalem. But, if we glance at the miracles and the mention of the miraculous in St John, we shall not find any more difference than the difference of atmosphere explains. We may note that it is specially important in the case of St John to keep in view and distinguish from one another:—

(1) *The motive of our Lord* in doing the miracle;
(2) *The effect* it produces on those who witness it;
(3) *The view taken* of it *by the Evangelist.*

(*a*) *The Turning of the Water into Wine.* —Our Lord's *motive* to do this miracle is described in the words of His mother, "They have no wine." We should not have anticipated that His first miracle would have been done to relieve a social awkwardness, to save hosts and guests from embarrassment at a friendly gathering.

The only parallel which throws light on His doing so is His use of the anger of a host when his invitation is slighted, as a parable of the Divine wrath with the indifference of men. But there is no denying that on the face of the story this *is* His motive. The *result* of this beginning of signs, in which He manifested forth His glory, is that His disciples believed on Him. And this result seems to be the main point of interest to the Evangelist. It is to be noted (1) that the glory of God is here as elsewhere the showing forth of God's goodness, here in particular of His sympathy with the common life of men; (2) that the phrase "believed on Him" is in itself quite vague, and, when used of His disciples, does not necessarily indicate more than a beginning of the belief which was to grow and deepen hereafter. It is as giving a step in the belief of the disciples that the story is told.

(*b*) *The Signs at Jerusalem.*—"Many believed on His name, beholding His signs

which He did." Here nothing is said as to the motive, but the result is a belief which was unworthy. The signs ought to have led those who believed to a deeper and more real belief. The most natural interpretation of the story would be that they were impressed by the wonder of the signs, but did not appreciate their moral and spiritual significance, and that in this, as he looked back, the Evangelist saw the germ of the rejection.

(*c*) *Nicodemus and the Signs.*—"No one can do these signs that thou doest, except God be with him."[1] Here, again, our Lord finds the belief evoked by the signs quite inadequate, not because it has not led to a sufficiently high appreciation of His person, but because it has not been informed and inspired by a deep sense of spiritual need.

(*d*) *The Healing of the Nobleman's Son.*— Our Lord here expressly repudiates the idea of pandering to a mere desire for signs and wonders.[2] The motive necessary to evoke the miracle is not supplied till the sheer

[1] St John iii. 2. [2] St John iv. 48.

passionate need breaks out in the cry, "Sir, come down ere my child die." The Evangelist's interest in the story is probably, as we have said, the manifestation of this sense of need at the very threshold of the Galilean Ministry, "this is the second sign that Jesus did, when He was come out of Judæa into Galilee."[1] The result is belief on the part of those who had felt the moral significance of the miracle, the Divine relief of need, "The father himself believed, and his whole house."

(*e*) *The Healing of the Impotent Man at the Pool.*—This miracle is twice described by our Lord not as a "sign" but as a "work," in both cases in a context where, speaking of the miracles as from the Father, He would naturally so describe them. His motive in doing the miracle is described thus,[2] "When Jesus saw him lying, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case." And with this agrees His later reference to the miracle,[3] "Are ye wroth with Me, because

[1] St John iv. 54. [2] St John v. 6. [3] St John vii. 23.

I made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath?" The motive therefore of the most critical miracle at Jerusalem was compassion, including the directly spiritual aim which is indicated by His saying to the man, "Behold, thou art made whole, sin no more." The reference to the Father, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," in which a Divine claim is founded on the work, appears afterwards, not as giving the motive of the miracle, but as a defence against the accusation of having violated the law of the Sabbath. The effect of the miracle is purely negative. The work of compassion done on the Sabbath Day was the first cause why the Jews sought to kill Jesus. And the miracle is important in the view of the Evangelist, as the first step in a rejection, rooted in the fact that, while the very works He did bore witness of Him that the Father had sent Him, they had not the Father's word abiding in them.

(*f*) The story of the *Feeding of the Five Thousand* begins with a passing mention vi, 1–1

that the great multitude followed Him because of the signs that He did on them that were sick. The motive of the miracle itself is described in the words: "Jesus, lifting up His eyes, and seeing that a great multitude cometh unto Him, saith unto Philip, Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?" The natural construction to be placed on these words is that the desire to feed those who needed food was His motive. And the absence of the words: "He had compassion on them," which occur in St Mark and St Matthew, does not neutralise this suggestion here any more than in St Luke. The result of the miracle was that, "when the people saw the sign which He did, they said, This is of a truth the Prophet that cometh into the world." And the superficial and unspiritual nature of the belief thus expressed is indicated in the words that follow, "Jesus therefore perceiving that they were about to come by force, to make him a king, withdrew." To the Evangelist the miracle plainly is important, as leading

up, not to this inadequate belief, but to the discourse that follows. And *The Walking on the Sea* appears to be added as a historical link in the chain of events which connected the discourse with the Feeding of the Five Thousand. The shallowness of the belief produced by the original miracle is once more emphasised in our Lord's opening words to the multitude, "Ye seek Me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled." The mere desire for the physical relief was the lowest motive. The next stage was that, seeing the signs, they should be led to seek Him, and that not for the sake of the meat that perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life.

(*g*) *The mention of His "works" by His brethren,* when they are urging Him to go up to Jerusalem to the Feast of Tabernacles, presents difficulties, but they are not material to the question we are now considering. They say, "Depart hence, and go into Judæa, that Thy disciples also may behold Thy works which thou doest.

For no man doeth anything in secret, and himself seeketh to be known openly. If Thou doest these things, manifest Thyself to the world. For even His brethren did not believe in Him." The view of the miracles presented is in any case the view of those whom the Evangelist reckons as not "believing," although they are urging Him to manifest Himself to the world by His works. And, though it is not clear who are meant by "Thy disciples," the view appears to be that the doing of miracles in Galilee was in itself doing them secretly, whereas doing them at Jerusalem would be of itself doing them openly. Probably the check which our Lord, for reasons which we have noted, imposed on the publishing of His miracles in Galilee lends point to the description of the Galilean miracles as done secretly. But plainly there is nothing in the passage which throws any light on the question of a difference in our Lord's motive in doing miracles in the two cases.

(*h*) Our Lord's *words at the Feast of*

Tabernacles as to the healing of the impotent man,[1] "I did one work, and ye all marvel," so far as they go, represent the attitude of mind of mere wonder as the wrong attitude; and the following words, "Are ye wroth with Me, because I made a man every whit whole on the Sabbath Day?" show that the right attitude of mind in the presence of the miracle was an appreciation of the moral and spiritual character of the work as a work of mercy. This would have been to judge righteous judgment.

(*i*) *The Healing of the Man born blind* is ushered in by a question of the disciples and an answer of our Lord, "Rabbi, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he should be born blind?" Jesus answered, "Neither did this man sin, nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. We must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day. . . . When I am in the world, I am the Light of the world." The question

[1] St John vii. 21

is in its substance a question as to the Providential permission of evil. And the spirit in which the question is asked is the Pharisaic spirit, the spirit of judgment. The question is in accord with the idea underlying the merciless and contemptuous judgment of the Pharisees, "Thou wast altogether born in sin." Our Lord's answer directs their attention to a different aspect of the Providence of God. They are to ask not, What sin, in the working of God's Providence, produced this visitation as its punishment? but, What occasion does the Providence of God afford to us in this visitation for the showing forth of His glory? "The works of God," "The works of Him that sent Me," must naturally be taken, in the light of the language used in reference to the healing of the impotent man, as the works of compassion and love in which God's character and His glory are manifested. But it is true that, as the spiritual antagonism between our Lord and the Jews is developed, the manifestation becomes more and more a mere manifesta-

tion, to them even a manifestation of judgment, though to the man healed a manifestation of Divine Love. The motive then is the manifestation of Divine Love. The effect of the miracle is, in the Pharisees, the intensification of the antagonism which arose from their incapacity to appreciate its moral significance. In the blind man himself the effect of the miracle is to lead him to believe on the Son of Man (or the Son of God), but it cannot be plausibly argued that he, with his deliverance from darkness fresh upon him, was moved by the sheer wonder and power as apart from the mercy and love shewn forth to him.

The comments in the discussion among the Pharisees on this miracle, "This man is not from God, because He keepeth not the Sabbath, but others said, How can a man that is a sinner do these signs?" give a striking illustration of the intrinsic difficulty of separating the two aspects of the sign, its wonder and its moral character. It was wrong to work on the Sabbath, therefore the inclination to yield to the mere wonder

must be resisted. But, on the other hand, the nature of the signs was inconsistent with the hypothesis that the doer was a sinner.

(*i*) Our Lord's *words at the Feast of Dedication*[1] come in association with the thought of the shepherd who gives pasture and deliverance, and lays down his life for the sheep, and in doing these things is in perfect sympathy with the Father; and, so coming, they give the strongest justification of the plea which we make for the moral and spiritual content of such phrases as "the works of My Father." The words are, "The works that I do in My Father's name, these bear witness of Me," "Many good works (ἔργα καλά) have I showed you from the Father," "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not, but if I do them, though ye believe not Me, believe the works, that ye may know and understand that the Father is in Me and I in the Father." There is absolutely nothing in the words themselves to suggest that it is as mere works of

[1] St John x. 25-38.

wonder and power that they justify His Divine claim. There is everything in the context to force upon them the interpretation, if it needed forcing, that it is the moral and spiritual meaning of the works as works of Love which vindicates the claim "I and the Father are one."

(*k*) In the miracle of *the Raising of Lazarus* we advance one stage further towards the miracle as a mere manifestation of the Divine Glory, because, as the Jerusalem Ministry approaches to its climax, the antagonism of the Jews makes our Lord's appeal, in its relation to them, more and more despairing and defiant. To the world that rejects He must manifest the Life at any cost, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. As though to atone for this, to the inner circle of the disciples, and to those whom the miracle relieves, it is laden with more tenderness of love than any other. And the further purpose of deepening the faith of the disciples is expressly stated, "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there to the

intent ye may believe." It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the deliberate delay, when "He abode two days in the place where He was" after He heard that Lazarus was sick, was intended to enhance the manifestation of the life-giving power, and that the miracle was intended to be a final challenge, a final vindication of the life-giving power. But it is notable, in this connection, that there is no special assertion of the Divine claim in connection with the miracle. It is a final manifestation of the life-giving power, in which indeed the Divine claim was involved, but from which it only emerges into separate prominence when the life-giving power itself is controverted. On the theory we are disputing as to the view of miracles in this Gospel, such emphasis of the Divine claim would seem to be demanded in connection with this miracle above all. As it is the miracle is done[1] "for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby," and Martha before the miracle professes that

[1] St John xi. 4.

she "has believed that He is the Christ the Son of God," but there is no fresh utterance parallel with "My Father worketh hitherto and I work;" "Before Abraham was I am;" "I and My Father are one." Instead, there is the great utterance of the life-giving power, "I am the Resurrection and the Life." And in the light of this utterance it is impossible to maintain that the result, the belief of "the Jews which came to Mary and beheld that which He did," was produced by a mere wonderful manifestation of power, apart from the spiritual significance of the work. The other result, the carrying of the news to the Pharisees, raises the question for them,[1] "What do we? for this man doeth many signs. If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him: and the Romans will come and take away both our place and nation." Here the belief, to which they fear the signs will lead, is the belief which would lead to our Lord being accepted as a political leader—the kind of belief which

[1] St John xi. 47.

had led the Galileans to wish to come and take him by force to make Him king—not the belief which recognised His own higher Divine claim. The two multitudes who escorted Him and met Him on His way into Jerusalem, those who were with Him when He had called Lazarus out of the tomb, and those who had heard that He had done this sign, greeted Him accordingly as the "King of Israel," and our Lord accepted their homage without distinguishing between the few who had in any measure entered into the spirit of the kingdom, and the many who looked only for a great political leader of the nation.

(*l*) In the *final summary of the rejection* the Evangelist says,[1] "Though He had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on Him," and the want of belief is attributed to the hardening of the heart, a phrase which describes the moral obliquity of vision, the spiritual blindness, that prevented them from discerning the

[1] St John xii. 37.

moral and spiritual significance of the signs.

(*m*) Our *Lord's knowledge* of the hearts and minds of men and of the future course of events has been represented as a markedly miraculous element in the story of this Gospel. If the suggestion means that He is represented as having knowledge such as could be attained by perfect humanity, with that Divine empowerment and inspiration of its faculties which belonged to the true ideal of humanity as manifest in Him, it is plainly true that this kind of knowledge is displayed and dwelt upon in a greater degree in this Gospel. But the difference is only one of degree, and the degree of difference is not greater than is accounted for by the aim of the Gospel—the manifestation of the life-giving Christ as the Son of God. If the suggestion is that the knowledge shown by our Lord is represented as Divine in any sense beyond this, such a view might be imposed on the story, but it does not fairly arise out of the story. There are no instances which

demand this interpretation. As we attain to fuller knowledge, it would appear that we shall more and more view all our Lord's miraculous activity from this point of view.[1] It will not therefore be less miraculous. It is towards such a view of the miraculous that the word "works," St John's characteristic name for miracles, tends to direct our minds.

[1] "Christ's humanity is in the New Testament regarded as normal, in the sense that everything that belonged to His manhood is to belong to ours, in and through Him. He is regarded as setting the standard of what humanity in the purpose of God is, through Him, capable of becoming; but as compared to humanity as we find it at present among ourselves His humanity is supranormal."—The Bishop of Birmingham allows me to make this quotation from an unpublished paper.

CHAPTER III

THE PICTURE OF OUR LORD IN ST JOHN AND IN THE THREE

§1. *Do the two Pictures harmonise?*

When we have been considering the various contrasts between St John's Gospel and the Three, the question very naturally arises whether the general picture of our Lord in St John harmonises with the picture of the Galilean Gospels. And on this question some light is thrown by the difference of purpose between the two stories on which we have been dwelling.

The question is not very easy to answer, partly because it is not very easy to ask. The question is not whether, if we had St John's Gospel alone, it would leave us with the same picture as if we had the

Galilean Gospels without the Fourth. It is not a question of identity. It is a question of harmony between the pictures presented by stories written from professedly different points of view. Is there such a harmony between the two? Plainly with the Three the human character is more prominent, in St John the Divine Communion.[1] Are we to say that in St John the Divine obscures the human; or, by a fusion in the mind of the writer who penetrates below the surface and brings into prominence elements in the character present, though less obvious, in the earlier story, has the Divine become human and the human Divine? Are we right in saying that we miss in St John the simplicity, the naturalness, of the display of sympathy and pity and patience and humility, and that the traditional acceptance of the equal authority of the four Gospels has led us to imagine that we can combine into one what are really incompatible presentations?

What does the view we have taken of

[1] Drummond, p. 15.

St John suggest as to the causes of the difference in his picture?

§2. *First Cause of the Difference in St John's Picture—his own Personality.*

First among these causes comes the character and mind of the person whose impression the Gospel gives to us. It is one secret of the value of the different Gospels that they give us the impression made by our Lord on various types of mind, and we should say that on the face of it the writer of the Fourth Gospel is a far more marked personality than the writers of the other Three. This is in part due to the possession of his whole mind and character by the subject of his story. He reflects that which he pictures. But this again, in its turn, is due to some natural kinship between his own mind and the aspect of the story which he presents. It is impossible to marshal the evidence for and against the view that the personality of the writer plays a large part in determining

the character of the picture. We can only say, and appeal to any reader of the Gospel to allow, that the impression of the individuality of the author is strong. He is not like other men. He is a strange, unearthly soul. Like St Paul, we could imagine him to have been caught up into the third heaven, and to have heard things unspeakable, and ever after to have carried about with him the inspiration of the high air that he had breathed. He looks to the eternal significance of the things that are seen. His spirit dwells in the eternal world. To him the present is the eternal. On the other hand, he has a natural gift for intimacy, for a sympathy that goes below the surface, and that by the insight of sympathy reads motives and meanings. The body of things is to him informed and penetrated through and through by their soul. His senses are spiritual, and his pictures of the scenes in which he lived glow with the delight of moments of rare spiritual communion, in which every detail as it is remembered seems illumined

by a light from within—a light that belongs to its very self, to the experience which, because it is transfused with the light of this vision, lives in his mind as though it were present still. Above all, it is a passionate spirit. His faculties are quickened into full action by the still enthusiasm of devotion which is the true expression of his nature, the life in which his character is fully manifested, in which he truly lives. Hence there is given to him a realisation above that of other men of the issues of human life, of the glory to which men may rise, of the horror of the deeds that they may do. His judgments are most terrible, because they are the judgments of the white light of love.

§3. *Second Cause—his Purpose to Picture the Rejection of the Son of God.*

The second great cause of the difference in St John's picture of our Lord is the aspect under which he presents Him, as the rejected Son of God, as manifesting

His Divinity under the pressure of the rejection of the offer of Eternal Life. On this we have dwelt sufficiently in what goes before. There must be an almost infinite difference between the picture of a Christ who is accepted, and the picture of a Christ who is rejected. Add to this that the fact of the rejection tended to bring into clear and awful contrast the character and nature of Him who was rejected, His revelation of the Eternal Father, and His own Eternal Being. Add to this, again, that the whole drama is seen as reflected in the soul of one, who, alone among the Evangelists declaring that which he had seen with his eyes, had himself met the offer of Eternal Life with the awed and loving acceptance of a spirit that entered into the very spirit of the gift. Add to this, again, that he is one, who through a long life had lived not only in the memory of the giving but in the experience of the fruition of the gift, to whom the present spiritual experience had become a part of the memory, and the memory a part of the present spiritual experience. We have

here considerations which go a very long way to account for the uniqueness of the picture, not to mitigate the contrast between the two stories, but to account for it however great it may be.

§4. *The Galilean Picture gives* (1) *the First Appeal of Christ to Man in the World.*

If we turn to the picture of the Galilean Gospels, we may put first some considerations which tend further to account for the contrast. The purpose of these Gospels was to record the beginning of the Gospel. And the story they tell is the story of how our Lord formed in the first members of His Fellowship the character which would fit them for the gift they were to receive. They present the Gospel accordingly in its first contrast with the worldly spirit from which they were to be weaned. There is a very obvious reason why this picture of our Lord, presenting His Gospel in its contrast with the spirit of the world, should always powerfully appeal to us. The world

is with us still. The spirit of Christ and the spirit of the world hold over us a divided dominion. The Galilean Gospels present the Christ as He appealed to those to whose spiritual position our own far too nearly corresponds. Their spiritual situation is one with which we are more familiar. We are more at home with the Christ who made His appeal to it. There is no such thing to be found by man as an abstract and absolutely true picture of any personality. This is not the nature of truth. There is only to be gained by us or by any one the picture of the personality as it presents itself to the degree and kind of apprehension which men bring to it. We bring to the apprehension of the Personality of Christ far more readily the kind and degree of apprehension from which in His Galilean Ministry He was leading His disciples on. And, even apart from any question of our instinctive sympathy and preference, the Galilean Gospels do present this historical moment in the growth of the apprehension of Christ, the first contrast between the

spirit of Christ and the spirit of worldly interests, of worldly religion, and worldly expectation.

§5. (2) *The Human Perfection of Christ.*

Again the Galilean Gospels presents us with the first naïve recognition of the charm and power of our Lord's human perfection. From this we are to rise to the knowledge in Him of the Divine. But as the ascent is made the Human is transfused with the Divine, glorified and transfigured beyond the recognition of those who still stand upon the lower steps from which the ascent is to be made. The glorified Humanity is not less but more truly Human, but it is less familiar to our own apprehension. The beginning is easier to understand than the end, except to those who shall have reached the end.

§6. *But the Galilean Gospels show the Hidden Glory.*

But, on the other hand, the picture of our Lord in the Galilean Gospels has in it elements which suggest something behind and beyond. Every now and then there breaks in upon the simple story the sense of a grandeur, a fear, a mystery. Behind the Christ who heals the sick and teaches in parables, there is the Christ who goes apart into the wilderness to pray, who comes back saying, "It is I, be not afraid;" the Christ of the Transfiguration, to whom they say, as in a new and other world, "Lord, it is good for us to be here;" the Christ who breaks in upon their peace with the predictions of the Passion, and the revelation of a mysterious task of patience and love, a baptism with which He has to be baptized, and He is straitened till it be accomplished; the Christ of the Agony, who strives in familiar spiritual communion with the Eternal Father: He is in an

alien atmosphere even among His own, "How long shall I be with you, how long shall I suffer you?" and when He thanks the Father because He has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes, He speaks of a communion with the Father which is the hidden reality of all this passing scene, "All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father, and no one knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any know the Father save the Son, and He to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." There is a Christ within the Christ in the Galilean Gospels, whose presence, dimly felt in these, is revealed only in St John, though even there we are reminded that "Jesus was not yet glorified," and St John himself watches the revelation of the mystery reverently, and as from afar, as though already and always he had heard Him saying, "Touch Me not."

7. *And in St John we have not lost the Christ of Galilee.*

And in St John, on the other hand, the Christ of the Galilean Gospels has by no means disappeared from view. In scene after scene He is present still. He is seen no longer with Galilean eyes, but we can imagine the stories of the turning of the water into wine, of the sitting by the well at Sychar, of the healing of the impotent man at the pool, of the man born blind, of the raising of Lazarus, as they would have been told by the Three, the same events, and those just such events as they did tell, with less eager absorption of significant details, with less devoted imprint on the memory of a look or of a word, less radiant with the glory that shone through them. But we are face to face in St John with the same or even greater tenderness and sympathy—there is nothing

in the Three to parallel the sheer humanity of the feeling and the repression of feeling in the story of Lazarus; we are face to face with a humility more amazing because of its majesty, and with a simplicity in the direct appeal of love, which shines through the dark cloud of the rejection in the very unveiling of the Eternal Light.

§8. *He makes the Eternal Love a Fact.*

For it is not that St John's Gospel takes us away from the world of fact into a world of ideas, or away from the world of fact into the region of Eternal Truth. Rather the Truth, which in the Galilean Gospels is the underlying idea, has become with St John the present and immediate fact. The Christ of St John is not less but more the Christ of fact than the Christ of the Galilean Gospels, because the Truth presented as fact in Jerusalem is more vivid and more intimate and more universal in its appeal. The fusion of the picture of the Three

with the picture of St John is not effected by our going to Galilean Gospels for the actual Christ, and then letting St John breathe into the picture the spirit of the ideal and the Eternal. Even if St John's Gospel stood alone, the Christ of St John would stand before us as the Christ of fact. Not merely is it the purpose of the Evangelist that He should do so—"He dwelt among us and we beheld His glory." Not merely does He stand as a Living Person in a real world, who says: "Take these things hence," or, "Go call thy husband," or, "Arise, take up thy bed, and walk," or, "Go, and sin no more," or, "Where have ye laid Him?" He brings into the region of fact the great Eternities. He who says: "Before Abraham was I am," stands as a living man upon the earth. The Eternal Love of God is manifest in fact, in our world of sin and struggle and need in Him who says, "My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me, and I give unto them Eternal Life, and no one shall snatch them

out of My hand. My Father, which hath given them unto Me, is greater than all, and no one is able to snatch them out of the Father's hand. I and the Father are One."

UNION THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
NEW YORK

226.5Q
46462 R41
AUTHOR
Richmond, W.
TITLE
The Gospel of the Rejection
226.5Q
R41
46462